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PROPOSALS FOR THE FUTURE ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS
FOR THE LONDON BOROUGH OF BEXLEY

1. We, the Local Government Boundary Commission for England, having
   carried out a review of the electoral arrangements for the London Borough
   of Bexley in accordance with the requirements of Section 50(3) of the
   Local Government Act 1972, present our proposals for the future electoral
   arrangements for that London borough.

2. In accordance with the procedure laid down in Section 60(1) and (2)
   of the 1972 Act, notice was given on 10 June 1975 that we were to under-
   take this review. This was incorporated in a consultation letter addressed
   to Bexley Borough Council, copies of which were circulated to the Greater
   London Council, the London Boroughs Association, the Association of
   Metropolitan Authorities, the Members of Parliament for the constituencies
   concerned, the headquarters of the main political parties and the Greater
   London Regional Council of the Labour Party. Copies were also sent to the
   editors of local newspapers circulating in the area and of the local
   government press. Notices inserted in the local press announced the start
   of the review and invited comments from members of the public and from any
   interested bodies.

3. Bexley Borough Council were invited to prepare a draft scheme of
   representation for our consideration. In doing so, they were asked to
   observe the rules laid down in Schedule 11 to the Local Government Act 1972
   and the guidelines which we set out in our letter of 10 June 1975 about
   the proposed size of the council and the proposed number of councillors
   for each ward. They were asked also to take into account any views
   expressed to them following their consultation with local interests.
We therefore asked that they should publish details of their provisional proposals about six weeks before they submitted their draft scheme to us, thus allowing an opportunity for local comment.

4. On 1st March 1976, Bexley Borough Council submitted their draft scheme of representation. The Council proposed to divide the area of the borough into 25 wards each returning 1, 2 or 3 councillors to form a council of 62 members.

5. The Borough Council's submission included copies of the correspondence received by them during their local consultations. We reviewed this, together with an alternative scheme which had been sent to us by a local political party and another alternative scheme submitted by three constituency political associations.

6. We studied the Council's draft scheme and noted that it would provide a satisfactory basis for the future representation of the borough in compliance with the rules in Schedule 11 to the Local Government Act 1972 and our guidelines. Neither of the alternative schemes submitted for our consideration nor the other suggestions made to us appeared to offer any clear advantages over the Council's draft scheme. Accordingly, we decided to adopt the draft scheme as the basis for our draft proposals.

7. We decided to adjust the boundaries between the St Mary's ward and the Blendon and Penhill ward and between the Foots Cray and Sidcup East wards in order to achieve a better standard of representation. After consulting Ordnance Survey, we made a number of minor alterations to ward boundaries in order to secure boundary lines which were more readily identifiable. We formulated our draft proposals accordingly.
8. On 6 September 1976 we issued our draft proposals and these were sent to all who had received our consultation letter or had commented on the Council's draft scheme. The Council were asked to make these draft proposals, and the accompanying map which defined the proposed ward boundaries, available for inspection at their main offices. Representations were invited from those to whom they were circulated and, by public notices, from other members of the public and interested bodies. We asked for comments to reach us by 5 November 1976.

9. Bexley Borough Council informed us that they accepted our draft proposals subject to a minor realignment of the boundary between the proposed Sidcup East and Foots Cray wards. They also forwarded a Memorandum of Dissent recording the Minority Party's disagreement with the Council's views.

10. The local political party, mentioned in paragraph 5 above, objected to our draft proposals and reaffirmed their alternative scheme. Objections were received from the three constituency political associations who had previously submitted an alternative scheme. Two of the associations reiterated their proposals for the Bexleyheath and Sidcup Parliamentary Constituency areas. The third association submitted revised plans for the Erith and Crayford Constituency area. Both the alternative schemes had support, either in part or as a whole, from a number of local residents. We also received objections from several residents to many of the wards in our draft proposals.
11. In view of these comments, we decided that we needed further information to enable us to reach a conclusion. Therefore, in accordance with Section 65(2) of the 1972 Act and at our request, Mr C W G T Kirk, OBE, was appointed as an Assistant Commissioner to hold a local meeting and report to us.

12. The Assistant Commissioner held a local meeting at the Town Hall, Erith on 19 April 1977. A copy of his report to us is attached at Schedule 1 to this report.

13. In the light of the discussion at the meeting and his inspection of the areas concerned, the Assistant Commissioner recommended that our draft proposals should be confirmed, subject to the modification of the boundary between the proposed Belvedere and Thamesmead East wards; the amalgamation of the proposed Northumberland Heath and Parsonage wards into one 3-member ward, to be called Northumberland Heath; the transfer of the Coldblow area to the proposed St Mary's ward; the transfer of the remainder of the proposed North Cray and Coldblow ward to the proposed Foots Cray ward to form one 2-member ward named Cray; and the transfer of the eastern side of Oxford Road to the proposed Sidcup East ward.

14. We reviewed our draft proposals in the light of the comments which we had received and of the report of the Assistant Commissioner. We concluded that the amendments recommended by the Assistant Commissioner should be accepted. Subject to these modifications, we decided that our draft proposals should be confirmed as our final proposals.
15. Details of these final proposals are set out in Schedules 2 and 3 to this report. Schedule 2 gives the names of the wards and the number of councillors to be returned by each. Schedule 3 is a description of the areas of the new wards. The boundaries of the new wards are defined on the attached map.

PUBLICATION

16. In accordance with section 60(5)(b) of the Local Government Act 1972, a copy of this report and a copy of the map are being sent to Bexley Borough Council and will be available for public inspection at the Council's main offices. Copies of this report (without map) are being sent to those who received the consultation letter and to those who made comments.

Signed

EDMUND COMPTON (Chairman)

JOHN M RANKIN (Deputy Chairman)

PHYLLIS BOWDEN

J T BROCKBANK

MICHAEL CHISHOLM

R R THORNTON

ANDREW WHEATLEY

N DIGNEY (Secretary)

7 July 1977
THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARY COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND

ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE LONDON BOROUGH OF BEXLEY

Report of C.W.C.T. Kirk

INTRODUCTION

1. On 28th February 1977 the Secretary of State, in pursuance of section 65(2) of the Local Government Act 1972 appointed me to be an assistant commissioner to hold a local inquiry or carry out any consultation with respect to the review by the Local Government Boundary Commission for England of the electoral arrangements for the London Borough of Bexley.

2. In response to an invitation from the Commission in a letter dated 10th June 1975, the Bexley London Borough Council on 1st March 1976 submitted to the Commission a draft scheme for the division of this London Borough into 25 wards returning 62 councillors. This scheme was duly advertised. By a letter dated 6th September 1976 the Commission announced their draft proposals for 25 wards returning 62 councillors, largely based on the Council's draft scheme. The Commission's proposals were duly advertised and attracted various representations to the Commission in addition to those received by the Commission in response to the advertisement of the Council's draft scheme. Among them were alternative schemes submitted by the Bexley Borough Local Government Committee of the Labour Party (for 24 wards with 62 councillors) and by the local Liberal Associations (for 36 wards with 63 councillors).

3. All the schemes and proposals referred to in paragraph 2 were based on the 1975 register of electors and projections to 1981 from it. By now the 1977 register of electors is in operation. The Council's officers have revised the figures for the 1977 and 1981 electorates in the Commission's proposals; and these proposals as so revised are set out in Appendix 1. They take account of the correction made in a letter dated 30th March 1977 from the Council to the Commission of an error in the electorates in the Barnehurst and Crayford wards. The officers also revised the projections for 1981 in the Labour and Liberal schemes but in the time available were unable to revise the 1975 figures in those schemes. To this extent, the comparison between the Commission's proposals and the other schemes is not complete, but as it is the 1981 figures which are more important, I feel the comparison is useful. The
Labour and Liberal schemes as submitted are set out in Appendices 2 and 2 respectively. Appendix 4 sets out the method adopted by the Council for the assessment of the 1981 electorate. Appendix 5 sets out the representations received by the Commission including some delivered to me at the meeting and some received after it.

On 31st March 1977 I visited this London Borough and inspected the wards, in particular those where changes were suggested by people who had written to the Commission.

An informal meeting was held at the Town Hall, Erith on Tuesday 19th April 1977 to discuss the proposals. It began at 10-30 a.m., adjourned for lunch at 1-0 p.m., resumed at 2-0 p.m. and ended at 6-30 p.m. In addition to myself there were 31 persons present. Their names appear in Appendix 6. At the start of the meeting the Council gave to those present a booklet explaining the background of the review of wards and giving details of the Council's draft scheme, the Commission's proposals and the Labour and Liberal schemes. This booklet was very helpful.

THE PRINCIPLES OF THE SCHEMES

Mr. A.M. Hawkes, Solicitor for the Council, opened the discussion by describing the invitation from the Commission to the Council to prepare a draft scheme and the procedure which had followed. He referred to the 1977 register of electors and the revised forecast for 1981.

Councillor Allan Jones who was spokesman in the matter for the Conservative majority on the Council, and also for the Bexleyheath, Erith and Crayford and Bexley/Sidcup Conservative Associations, said that issues were numerous and complex. He referred to the Council's agreement to the submission of a memorandum of dissent from the Council's decision. Unfortunately a misunderstanding had arisen about this memorandum but he believed the Commission had since had full information about it. As far as possible the group had taken account of all the Commission's criteria, but it had been difficult to meet all the criteria in all of the cases. The draft scheme proposed by the Council met, as nearly as and as fairly as could be, the guidelines to be followed. It seemed that the Commission had, on balance, come to the same conclusion in essentially adopting it as their draft proposals. While, at the time of the formulation of the Council's draft scheme, local consultations and the insertion of the required notices in the local press had been left to the Council's officers, the Conservative councillors did initiate a private meeting with representatives of the Labour Group (the only other group currently represented on the Council) on the 15th November, 1975. At that meeting, the embryo proposals were shown to the Labour members. It was pointed out that the proposals were incomplete and subject to alteration in the light...
of information on projected electorates, etc., which was still to be forthcoming, but the Labour group were asked to consider and then comment upon the suggestions to see what areas of agreement existed between the group and what modifications might be mutually acceptable. Unfortunately, at no subsequent time did the Labour group take up this offer although it was repeated in the Council Chamber.

8. Councillor Jones continued that the Council comprised of 68 members (59 Councillors and 9 Aldermen). As next year the Aldermen would be abolished and as Bexley was an education authority, it was felt that the present number of councillors should be increased to prevent too heavy a workload falling on those councillors elected in future. In addition, as some existing wards were over-large for their present number of councillors (e.g. Sidcup West) a greater number of boundary changes would occur if there was no increase in the number of elected members. Their view was that the new council should consist of 62 members and this had met with almost universal agreement, although the Liberals suggested 63. No representations have suggested that the number should be less than 62. However, there was a great gulf between them and the Labour Party as to how the 62 councillors should be distributed throughout the Borough. He considered Labour's proposals were grossly unfair on ratepayers in the Sidcup part of the Borough because at the time of the submission to the Commission of the Council's scheme in February 1976, the 1975 and 1981 projected electorates were

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Average per member (52)</th>
<th>1981 Projected</th>
<th>1981 Projected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Whole Borough</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>162,915</td>
<td>2627.6</td>
<td>164,767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td></td>
<td>2657.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since then 2 new electoral registers had come in. Both had shown an increase in the electorate in the Sidcup and Bexleyheath Parliamentary Constituencies and a decline in Erith and Crayford. The projection of the 1981 electorate had been updated by the Council's officers in the light of the latest information concerning planning permissions recently given and the programming of developments taking place. The 1977 and revised 1981 projected electorates were:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bexleyheath</td>
<td>51,368</td>
<td>2636.7</td>
<td>50,780</td>
<td>2651.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erith &amp; Crayford</td>
<td>62,005</td>
<td>2636.7</td>
<td>64,468</td>
<td>2651.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidcup</td>
<td>50,101</td>
<td>2636.7</td>
<td>49,172</td>
<td>2651.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Borough</td>
<td>163,474</td>
<td>2636.7</td>
<td>164,420</td>
<td>2651.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A fair distribution of council seats would be:

- Bexleyheath: 19
- Erith and Crayford: 24
- Sidcup: 19

The 1981 projected decline in the electorates for Bexleyheath and Sidcup was based, not on the clearance of existing dwellings, but on the assumption that occupancy rates would continue generally to fall. Should this not happen to the expected extent (or even at all) then, whilst the Erith and Crayford projection (which properly showed an increase largely due to developments at Thamesmead and one at Perry Street, Crayford) would also be affected, the overall result would re-inforce the Commission's draft proposals for the distribution of seats.

Councillor Jones then commented on the Liberal Party's proposals to create a 63 member authority (19 for Bexleyheath, 25 for Erith and Crayford and 19 for Sidcup). By using the same formula, but re-calculating for 63 members, an entitlement of 24 for Erith and Crayford and 19 for Bexleyheath was found. His group had considered other possibilities, but had come to the conclusion that a 62 member authority, with seats distributed as in the Commission's proposals, was the most satisfactory. Giving the benefit of 'rounding-up' (from 23.52 to 24 members) in the Erith and Crayford area, it conformed exactly to the entitlements on the present electorate and, if 19 members were only just allowable for Sidcup on the projected electorate, it was fully so on the present register and continuing private building in that part of the Borough might make the 1981 projection low in any event. He observed that the Commission's guidelines indicated that an elector/member ratio of 2500 electors per councillor would be regarded as the normal minimum. No less than 15 of the wards (mostly in Erith and Sidcup) appeared to be below this figure in the Liberal scheme.
10. Councillor Jones felt the sizes of the wards should be related to the communities. He had no feelings against 1 member wards as such.

11. Councillor C.F. Hargrave (Chairman of the Bexley Borough Local Government Committee of the Labour Party) agreed that this was a difficult and sensitive exercise. Whichever party did it must be concerned with the electoral possibilities of any changes. The temptations were especially great for the majority party. In this case he contended that the scheme was thoroughly vitiated by a determination on the part of the majority party to derive the maximum political advantage and that as a result, unsatisfactory boundaries had been drawn and local ties severed. This attitude of political partisanship had also manifested itself during the period of public consultation where it appeared that the Commission's intentions had been honoured in the letter rather than the spirit. He referred to paragraph 6 of the Commission's letter to the Chief Executive of 10th June 1975 which invited the Council to prepare a draft scheme 'taking into account any views expressed to them by local interests'. Several organisations did express views, yet no changes were made to the provisional scheme as a result of these representations. Instead the period between December 1975 and February 1976 had been used by the majority party to make substantial changes in Erith and Crayford rather than responding to any representations made. These major changes were made public only two weeks before the Council approved them and at no time was any explanation of them given. The Council in approving the provisional proposals in December 1975 did recognise the need for adjustment in Belvedere and Thamesmead because of likely population changes, but this in no way explained the change in the Northumberland Heath area and neither did it explain that made in Barnehurst. The Labour Party believed they had achieved a reasonable balance between the various considerations in the Act and the guidelines of the Commission. In drawing up their proposals they had been particularly influenced by the importance of preserving community ties, without doing too great a violence to the other considerations set out above, in these guidelines. They had been faced with certain difficulties. Their scheme had been based upon the projected figures for 1981 available in 1975. Yet these figures had been amended in April 1976 and only last week they had been made aware of yet further adjustment. Having regard to these changes and to reluctance of the Commission to accept a ratio of electors per Councillor below 2,500 save in exceptional circumstances, they had found it necessary to make two amendments to their proposals to which he would refer later in the meeting. Councillor Jones had contended that the Labour scheme was unfair to Sidcup and over generous to Erith and Crayford. He did not accept this charge. If the projected 1981 electorate for each constituency were divided by the number of councillors proposed under the Commission's proposals and the Labour scheme the following were the averages of electors to councillors in each constituency:-
From this it was apparent that the former discriminated against Erith and Crayford and, given that both proposals envisaged a maximum of 62 councillors, he believed that the greater social and environmental problems in the north lent support to Labour's proposals. There was no justification for increasing the number of Councillors to 63. Generally he was opposed to 1 member wards, which in his opinion were justified only for small isolated communities.

12. Mr. P.Browne (Chairman of the Sidcup Liberal Association) contended that:

(1) Ward boundaries should represent the needs of the people rather than the interests of political parties.

(2) In order for the people not to be disenchanted with local politics the wards must be districts which the electorate identified with and recognised. When too large this sense of local identity was lost.

(3) The ideal situation would be for a system of single member wards throughout the Borough, each with an electorate of about 2,600. However, since the majority of the local communities had a natural electorate of between 4 and 6 thousand, they needed 2 councillors adequately to represent them. His Associations therefore constructed their scheme to represent the communities with one or two members as appropriate.

(4) The advantage of having only 1 or 2 councillors per ward was that it enabled groups such as residents, ratepayers, community associations, action groups or independents to have a better chance of electing a councillor against the major political party machines.

(5) Small wards enabled the elected councillors to maintain closer contact with their electorate and to represent their interests better.
The Liberal's proposed wards were a recognition of community areas, which had been long established or were newly developed. Both of these had hitherto been ignored in the drawing up of electoral boundaries. This had been extensively detailed in their representations to the Commission. The cores of their wards coincided with the cores of local communities, but they were not dogmatic about the exact positioning of the boundaries, though they believed their proposals did in fact form reasonable divisions. They objected most strongly to the Commission's proposals because they took insufficient account of local ties. The sizes and shapes of the wards proposed both by the Commission and the Labour Party were far removed from the natural communities that they ought to be e.g. Sidcup East Ward with a projected electorate of 9,541 was far too big, and the boundaries of Labour's proposed Belvedere North Ward were ridiculous. They were opposed to the insistence on the principle of 3 member wards as these were being advocated for purely party political advantage rather than a genuine attempt at equitable and community representation. The Liberal's alternative proposals more accurately reflected local ties and had more easily identifiable boundaries than the Commission's proposals. He had reservations about the Council's latest projection of the 1981 electorate. He particularly criticised Step 5 in their calculation (see Appendix 4) because it took no account of potential future planning permissions which would increase the 1981 electorate. Generally however he accepted the projection except for the Crayford area. The Liberal's proposals produced 25 councillors for Erith and Crayford constituency and 19 for each of Bexleyheath and Sidcup. He thought this was as fair as the Council's scheme. There was an advantage in having an odd number of councillors.

ERITH AND CRAYFORD CONSTITUENCY

13. Councillor C. Packer (Bostall ward - Officer of the Erith and Crayford Conservative Association) said the wards suggested in the Commission's Draft proposals were essentially based on the existing ward structure, but took account of the fact that, since they were created, there had been an uneven change in the electorates. In addition, potential growth in the Thamesmead and, possibly, Perry Street areas had to be allowed for in the new structure without considering the creation of 4 member wards. In most cases, it was felt that the existing wards still reflected the basic communities. He then commented on the separate wards:

(1) Bostall. This ward comprised the present ward, but with a reversion to the pre-1965 boundary by the inclusion of the area on the north side of Woolwich Road, because the present electorate was otherwise too small to justify satisfactorily 3 members, especially on the 1981 projection.
and had little prospect of growth. The area to the north of Woolwich Road was formerly part of this ward in the old Erith Borough Council days and was, moreover, separated from the Belvedere area to some extent by the Lesness Abbey open space.

Belvedere and Thamesmead Wards. The community of Thamesmead was effectively a new town being built by the Greater London Council and in Greenwich on the former Plumstead and Erith marshes. Most of the residents there did not emanate from Bexley, but came from the inner London areas. Some consideration should be given as to how to involve the residents of this new area into the life of Bexley. The existing Belvedere ward had, as its northern boundary, the railway line. If the ward otherwise remained unchanged, (except for a small area North of Woolwich Road mentioned before) then it would have a slightly, (although possibly acceptable) large electorate whereas the Thamesmead ward would still remain on the small side for some years. The Thamesmead new town development would span the railway line to Abbey Road in the south and consideration had been given to adopting Abbey Road (a classified road) as the new northern boundary of the Belvedere ward, leaving the whole of the Thamesmead area as one ward. This would produce a satisfactory electorate in both the new Belvedere Ward and the new Thamesmead Ward. However, being mindful of the need to integrate the Thamesmead community into Bexley, consideration had been given to leaving the existing boundary along the railway, but extending it so that the existing community north of Belvedere Station would be placed in the Thamesmead ward. It was recognised that this North Belvedere community was a separate one from Thamesmead, but this proposal achieved 4 goals:

(a) The boundaries of the New Thamesmead ward would be strong and very easily identifiable.

(b) The electorates as between the Belvedere and Thamesmead Wards would be satisfactory.

(c) In any event, the level crossing at Belvedere Station which provided access between the areas to the north and south would eventually be closed when the Thamesmead Spine Road was complete which would orient the area on an east/west basis.

(d) Some integration of the new Thamesmead community into the life of Bexley was achieved.

For all of these reasons, the proposed Belvedere and Thamesmead wards were considered preferable to the alternatives. If the Commission wished to take account of the North Belvedere residents' representations he suggested that Abbey Road become the new Belvedere/Thamesmead boundary.
(2) Northumberland Heath. This ward had the same boundaries as the existing ward, less the Parsonage area where the opportunity had been taken to treat it as a separate community which, on balance, it was felt to be.

(4) Parsonage. He argued that the residents in this area, currently part of a Northumberland Heath ward, were a community on their own. They had their own shops, own pub and own school. They were physically separated from Northumberland Heath by a cemetery, playing fields and sports grounds and had really only one direct road access to Northumberland Heath. The 2 bus services ran to Belvedere and to Erith rather than Northumberland Heath and, in many respects, there was a greater affinity with Belvedere where many residents shopped and used the library, church and other facilities. The northern part of the Parsonage ward had once been in a Belvedere ward. The proposed eastern boundary of this ward was not only a polling district boundary, but was also a catchment area boundary for Belmont School. Because the Parsonage area did not appear to have the ties with the Northumberland Heath area that the rest of that ward had, he felt that, on balance, representation as a one member ward was appropriate.

(5) Erith. This proposed ward was almost identical to the existing ward of the same name. The sole change was the transfer of the Manor Road area to the proposed North End Ward. The reason for this was that the established Erith ward would otherwise be too large, especially on the 1981 projection, and the proposed North End ward at present too small. He recognised that the Manor Road area was something of a self-contained unit, and, with only one road access to Erith via the bridge, it was an area of its own, rather than an integral part of the Erith community. There were good reasons for the inclusion of this area in the proposed North End ward in the interests of electoral equality rather than making other (possibly substantial) changes to the existing ward structures.

(6) North End/Barnehurst North. This ward essentially comprised what was currently known as the Greystoke North ward. This existing 3 member ward had an electorate which would fully justify a 4th member if 4-member wards were permitted. At present it covered a number of communities, from the area between Colyers Lane and the railway in the west, through to North End Road and Slade Green in the east. He felt that the narrow western projection of this ward lying between Colyers Lane and the railway had little community attachment with the remainder of the existing ward. Since the present Greystoke ward was too large, it was therefore proposed that this western area could conveniently be separated from the remainder to form a one member Barnehurst North ward. This proposed ward
would have strong boundaries along the established existing ward boundaries of the railway, Erith Road and Colyers Lane and, with the roads Appleford Avenue to Edendale Road inclusive forming one pre-war development, the logical eastern boundary lay behind Edendale Road where it abutted the separate post-war Cheviot Close area development, the access to which lay to the east. This proposed Barnehurst North ward was an identifiable community on its own, with its own schools, and shops, in Erith Road although the latter also attracted passing trade. Unlike the remainder of the existing Crayford North ward, this new Barnehurst North ward would also have quite strong links with Northumberland Heath where the larger shopping centre, library, churches, and halls were. The remainder of the existing Crayford North ward together with the Manor Road area could remain unchanged as a 5-member ward, although, because of its association, should more properly be called North End.

Barnehurst and Crayford areas. These last two wards follow closely the existing Crayford West and Crayford Town wards. The established well defined boundaries and representation of both remained the same with the exception that the current boundary between them (Perry Street) was moved to the west to 'even-up' the electorate, (Crayford Town being otherwise rather too small), and with the Crayford West area being given its correct and local name of Barnehurst. Barnehurst was an identifiable and well known community centering around the local shops, garages, schools, swimming pool, library, park and halls etc. in Midfield Parade and Mayplace Road together with 2 churches and a residents association and should not be confused with the suggested Barnehurst North ward area with which Barnehurst had never been associated electorally and which was a separate community. The placement of Tea Vale in the South west of the new Crayford ward to which residents would look as a natural centre rather than Barnehurst was felt more appropriate on community grounds of the Barnehurst area. Subject to the addition of the small area west of Perry Street, the present Crayford Town ward (re-named Crayford) remained unchanged.

14. Councillor Hargrave (Labour) in reply made the following points:

(1) Parsonage Ward. This alteration to the provisional scheme of December 1975 had been made without explanation and for reasons unconnected with population changes. The bulk of the proposed Parsonage Ward had been part of the Northumberland Heath Ward since 1953. The recreation ground was intended not as a boundary between wards but as a
focal point of community activity within the ward. Moreover, the footpath between Swanton Road and Sussex Road was widely used for access to amenities in Northumberland Heath. Northumberland Heath had most of the community facilities and amenities such as shops, schools, youth and community centres, library, public houses, churches and meeting places. By contrast the proposed Parsonage Ward has a paucity of amenities with only one primary school and one public house. If Councillor Packer had visited the area recently he would have found that there were very few shops open for business.

Barnehurst. The provisional proposals envisaged a three member Barnehurst ward and he supported this with only minor variations. Yet it had been suddenly decided, seemingly for no other reason than the existence of a convenient railway line, to divide the proposed ward into a 1 member (Barnehurst North) ward and a 2 member (Barnehurst) ward. The proposal for Barnehurst North produced a ratio of electors to Councillor of 22/3 whereas his Party's proposal for a 3 member ward gave a more satisfactory average of 24/4 per member.

Belvedere/Thamesmead. A real problem faced the Council in the Belvedere area because maintaining the boundaries of the present 3 member ward would mean an electorate of 9862 by 1981. The Council's solution was to transfer the Harvel Crescent Polling District to Bostall ward and, far more contentiously, to transfer the area north of Belvedere Station to Thamesmead. He believed the latter proposal to be quite indefensible on community grounds. His alternative was to divide the ward on a more acceptable basis into a 2 member (Belvedere South) ward and a 2 member (Belvedere North) ward, the boundary between the two wards being very largely that between the former Belvedere and Abbey Wood wards. The Labour Party's representation to the Commission had set out the thinking behind this proposed division. He drew attention to the most recent projected 1981 figures for Thamesmead. The projected electorate for this 3 member ward was 8794 giving an average of 2931 per member. He suggested that this increase threw yet further doubts on the desirability of transferring part of Belvedere to Thamesmead. Although he was pleased to hear Councillor Packer say that the majority party were no longer insisting on the area north of the railway line being transferred to Thamesmead, he was unable to accept the eastern boundary of the ward proposed in the draft scheme because of its consequences for the Erith Town ward. To accept the eastern boundary proposed by his party would produce a rather high ratio of electors per councillor if a 3 member Belvedere ward were envisaged. That being so, he would continue to press for the adoption of Labour's proposals for two 2 member wards.
[4] Bostall Ward. In this ward the latest projected figures had yet further reduced an already somewhat low ratio of electors per councillor, under Labour's scheme. For this reason he suggested an adjustment between Belvedere South and Bostall with the Harvel Crescent polling district being transferred to the latter, to produce this result:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1981 electorate</th>
<th>Average per member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bostall</td>
<td>7411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belvedere S.</td>
<td>5049</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[5] Erith Town/Crayford North. On community grounds the transfer of the Manor Road area of the present Erith Town ward to the proposed North End ward was to be deplored. This area had always been part of Erith rather than Slade Green. There was no direct vehicular access between the two areas and he disputed the suggestion of Councillor Packer that there would soon be a bus service linking them.

15. Mr. Browne (Liberal) said the Labour Party's scheme was out of date and could not be compared with either the Commission's proposals or the Liberal's scheme. He preferred the Commission's proposals to the Labour Party's scheme.

16. Councillor Packer (Conservative) commented on the Labour and Liberal schemes for this constituency as follows:

(1) Labour Scheme.
   (i) It was felt that, in a 62 member authority, not more than 24 members in the Erith and Crayford area would be justified. The 25 suggested/presented an overprovision both at present and on the 1981 projection.

   (ii) The electorate in the proposed Bostall ward fell below the Commission's criteria having regard to the reasonable alternatives available (e.g., the Commission's proposal to incorporate the area to the north of Woolwich Road).

   (iii) The strong, well established and easily identifiable ward boundary of the railway had been abolished to enable not well related communities to be incorporated into one Barnehurst ward. The community to the north and the community to the south had little in common. The northern community tended to look towards Northumberland Heath whilst the southern community was centered around Midfield Parade and Mayplace Road.
Moreover, the railway, which was on an embankment for all but its western extremity, was very much a physical barrier. Except for the northern side of Northall Road, the whole area south of the railway was in its own catchment area different from that in the north with its own schools.

(iv) There was absolutely no geographic or community consideration why the eastern half of Castleton Avenue, Downbank Avenue, and Edendale Road were separated from the roads to the west. He took strong exception to this as the roads between Appledore Avenue to Edendale Road inclusive were built as one estate and the detachment of part of Castleton together with Downbank and Edendale would leave them virtually geographically isolated. The community in these roads regarded itself as a whole and recognised no division.

(v) The shape of the northern part of the suggested Grayford West ward, and also the shape of the proposed Belvedere North ward was such as to be confusing on the ground.

(vi) In the proposed Belvedere North ward and Belvedere South ward, the boundary along a footpath, side roads and an unmade road suggested a division which the community did not recognise at that point.

(vii) The placement of the eastern boundary of the Belvedere North ward down the centre of Ashburnham Road divided the local community existing in the roads from Poplar Mount to Willis Road in the east all of which were in the existing Erith Town ward, and which, amongst other things, fall in the same school catchment area, church parish etc., as did the roads to the east of Crabtree Manorway.

(2) Liberal Scheme.

Emanating from the Liberal's desire to avoid 3 member wards at all costs and by using obscure boundaries running in many cases through established communities, all existing wards (with the possible exception of the suggested Barneshurst Ward) were drastically changed. Many proposed wards and boundaries would be confusing on the ground. Moreover, about 9 of the proposed wards would have electorates under the normal minimum of 2500 per member, and some wards, e.g. Grayford West and Normandy would have no special community identity. He could not think that the Commission could really consider that such proposals met the criteria required for adoption.
17. Councillor E. Handy (Labour) supported the retention of the existing Northumberland Heath Ward. Councillor Packer's arguments were flimsy. He (Councillor Handy) lived in Swanton Road near the much used footpath which led from Parsonage to Northumberland Heath and the secondary school, playing areas and the rugby club. Most of the Parsonage shops had been closed. Single member wards had the disadvantage that one councillor might be absent through illness or for business or other reasons. 3 member wards were better as the members had a better chance of dealing with different matters. A single councillor would serve on only two or three committees; 3 members would among them serve on more. Nobody had supported the Council in this division of the wards. All the representations had been against the split.

18. Mr. N. Rushbrook said he lived in Sidcup but had been born and lived for 24 years in Brook Street and still had many friends in that area. He confirmed the communications between Northumberland Heath and Parsonage. A cricket club was supported by both. He saw no reason for the proposed split.

19. Councillor Hargrave (Labour) said there was no justification for the Council's Barnehurst Ward. Labour's 3 member ward was better on the latest figures. Barnehurst North ward was too big with 2993 electors for one councillor. He preferred one 3 member ward, which on the Council's proposal would have just under 7800 electors for 3 councillors.

20. Mr. Browne (Liberal) supported the Commission's Barnehurst and North Barnehurst wards. The former was quite different from the latter and they should not go together.

21. Mr. Michael Green of 54 Oakley Park, Bexley said he had spent 20 years in Barnehurst. He supported the Commission's proposals. The area had developed in three ways. In 1920/23 Barnehurst Village had been built; in the mid-30's had come the Wedlocks development north of the village; and later the new Ideal development north of the railway. The residents were annoyed when at the last re-warding the area had been called Crayford West. North of the railway the people in Barnehurst North associated more with Barnehurst than with Northumberland Heath. He preferred two wards to one ward.

22. Councillor A. Forsyth (Labour) said it was not sensible to separate the areas north and south of the railway which in this instance was not a divider as it was crossed in many places. He preferred that the two wards should be joined in one or for the existing Crayford West ward to be retained. Councillor Handy (Labour) agreed there should be one ward and pointed out that the playing ground and youth club for both areas were south of the railway.

23. Councillor Jones (Conservative) said that a 1 member ward was right for Barnehurst North as a small community. Both wards were viable. The Labour scheme for north of the railway divided an estate. Councillor Packer (Conservative)
added that Barnehurst North had never been part of Barnehurst and that it was right to split it off from Crayford.

24. Councillor Hargrave (Labour) objected to the part of Belvedere north of the railway being included in Thamesmead East ward as its south-eastern corner. It should remain in Belvedere. The problem was that the present Belvedere ward with a projected 1981 electorate of 2862 was too big. The hilly nature of Belvedere also created problems. Something had to be done about it. The Council had split off an integral part of the ward and put it into Thamesmead East. The proper solution was to divide Belvedere into two 2 member wards. The Labour Party proposed a reversion of the scheme they had submitted to the Commission by transferring polling district 2845 (664 electors) from the proposed Belvedere South ward to the proposed Bostall ward. The northern boundary of the Bostall ward would proceed westwards along Woolwich Road to a point past Tretoops Close where it would proceed northwards through Lesney Abbey Woods along the line indicated on borough maps until it met the northern boundary of the proposed Belvedere South ward. The revised 1981 electorate would be:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Electorate</th>
<th>Average per member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bostall</td>
<td>7411</td>
<td>2470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belvedere S</td>
<td>5049</td>
<td>2524</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The building of Thamesmead East 9 (south of the railway and in Belvedere) had been deferred until after 1981. He gave the following figures:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Electorate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Electorate of present Belvedere ward</td>
<td>9800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part to go to Bostall</td>
<td>664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thamesmead 9</td>
<td>540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised total</td>
<td>3600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Councillor as a 3 member ward</td>
<td>2367</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The revised 1981 projection pushed up the Council's Thamesmead East ward to 2931 per member because area 5E was to be built by 1981. The electorates for the south-eastern corner of Thamesmead East ward were:

- 1975 register: 725
- 1977 register: 721
- 1981 projection: 700
25. Mr. E.C. Standen (liberal) pointed out that before 1965 there had been annual elections, which had justified 3 member wards. Since then elections took place at 4 yearly intervals, which in his view made it important to plan for 1 and 2 member wards.

Mr. Colin Wright (Chairman, Bexleyheath Liberal Association) was willing to waive his objection to 3 member wards in return for the introduction of proportional representation.

Mr. Standen (Liberal) urged the Commission to take a fresh look. Communities should be identified. The single most important factor was the school and the area served by it.

26. Councillor Forsyth (Labour) disagreed with his party's proposals for these wards.

27. There ensued a general discussion in which it seemed Councillor Jones would be willing to consider including in Belvedere ward the south-east corner of Thamesmead East ward, with the boundaries (east and west) of the existing Belvedere ward at this point providing the figures were satisfactory. The Labour Party's scheme used the western boundary but moved the eastern boundary eastwards for a reason connected with the Manor Road area.

28. Councillor Hergrave (Labour) asserted there was no case for transferring the Manor Road area from Erith ward. There was no communication between Manor Road and Slade Green although the Council had put both in North End ward. The Manor Road residents were part of Erith and used the amenities in Erith. The Council's scheme and the Labour scheme had almost the same electorate:

| (Labour) | Erith Town | 2940 |
| (Council) | Erith | 2909 |

Councillor T. Lebar (Labour Erith Town Ward) expressed the great concern of the Manor Road residents about the prospect of their being separated from Erith, of which they had always been part. Manor Road was separated by fields from Slade Green and by the railway from North End. There were 930 electors there now and the 1981 projection was 890. There was only one road out of the Manor Road area and that led to Erith. There was another road but that was physically blocked by a barrier to prevent its use by other than emergency traffic.

29. Councillor Packer (Conservative) pointed out that the western boundary of the Labour Party's Erith Town ward ran along Ashburnham Road, whereas the boundary of the Council's Erith ward was along Halt Robin. He objected to the use of Ashburnham Road as a boundary. He suggested that the 99 bus route ran from Manor Road to Slade Green, but doubt was cast on this by several of those present.
Mr. Standen (Liberal) supported the Labour Party’s scheme and contended that the area from Norman Road to the Borough boundary should be one ward.

Mrs. K. Stutchbury (Labour) of 28 Manor Road said she had lived in Erith for many years and wanted to stay in Erith. She felt strongly about this and many of her neighbours supported her.

Mrs. C. Samuels of 115 Manor Road felt strongly that human needs had not been considered but that the residents had been dealt with as things. She protested at the Council’s proposal to transfer Manor Road from Erith. She wanted to stay in Erith. She was a member of the parent teacher association of the school in Erith serving Manor Road. The only way from Manor Road to Slade Green was through Erith.

Councillor D. Breaker (Labour - Crayford North ward) objected to the Commission’s proposal for Manor Road. The primary school in the area had been replaced by a school in Erith in Leslie Road. Manor Road emptied into Erith town centre across a cutting over a disused railway (formerly used for wharfage traffic). By its nature and position traffic from the area decanted into Erith.

Councillor Jones (Conservative) said that if the area west of Ashburnham Road were included in Belvedere ward that ward would be too big and it would have to be split into two 2 member wards, if Manor Road were to be kept with Erith. He objected to this effect on Belvedere ward because it would mean 25 members for the Erith and Crayford constituency which was one too many. One consequence of the domino effect of putting Manor Road into Erith was the Labour Party’s split of Parsonhurst North, to which he objected.

Mrs. Samuels said that the local ties of Manor Road with Erith were exceptionally important. Most of the residents there were elderly and collected their pensions in Erith.

Mrs. M.E. Smith said that the Belvedere people did not want Belvedere divided into two. The residents in the north were different from those in the south.

Councillor D. J. Delaney (Belvedere ward) supported one ward for Belvedere. Those in the north did not want segregation.

BELVEDELE SUBURB

Councillor J. R. Couchman (Chairman of Bexleyheath Conservative Association and Chairman of the Borough Council’s Social Services Committee) said the Commission’s proposals were sensible and criticised the Liberal’s scheme because (1) it was absolutely at odds with the guidelines. (2) the proposed St. Michaels ward destroyed what was
probably one of the most identifiable communities in this constituency. St. Michaels as presently constituted had extremely strong boundaries and both the Commission’s proposals and the Labour Party’s scheme sought to maintain those boundaries. St. Michaels had a very strong Residents Association of some 2500 members, many of the most active members of whom lived in the area which the Liberals would seek to make into the Hillsgrove one-member ward. St. Michaels as presently constituted except for two council estates (at Lodge Hill and Douglas Road) was built as a single estate by Stevens in the 1930’s. The Liberal scheme sought to destroy completely this community and placed it in three wards and to create a totally synthetic ward out of the council estate at Lodge Hill with the older private development in the 1st Avenue, Budleigh Crescent, Sidmouth Road and called it Hillsgrove. There was very little in common between these two parts of the proposed Hillsgrove ward. He knew this area very well because he had lived in it for four years and had been the President of St. Michaels Residents Association for two years. The Liberal scheme was factually incorrect as there was only one public house in the area they proposed for St. Michaels. The Liberals proposed St. Michaels Ward had extremely weak boundaries. The Liberal proposal did not stand up because it had never been and never would be a community. It would consist of two areas of housing to the north and south of the Broadway separated by a large shopping area (scheduled to become larger) and the Council’s own Civic Offices. There really was no community between these two areas of housing.

The Liberal scheme breached the parliamentary boundary in the Upton Ward at its south eastern corner. He had understood that parliamentary boundaries were to be left intact. While there were only a few residents involved he did feel that the adoption of this boundary would add a substantial and unnecessary complication.

35. Mr. G. Wright (Liberal) said he had lived in Hillsgrove and St. Michaels since 1936. He could not see the objection to Hillsgrove ward, which was a polling district. Several of the members of the St. Michaels Resident’s Association lived in Brompton or Danson. Names were not sacrosanct.

36. Mr. Standen (Liberal) said the boundary the Liberals had proposed for the Upton ward did correspond with the constituency boundary. Clock Tower was a local area. He criticised the Commission’s proposals for maintaining the existing boundaries to the East Wickham, St. Michael’s and Brompton Wards. He felt those were purely administrative zones and were artificial wards with little community identity. He also opposed the boundaries of the proposed Falconwood ward. They cut across an existing local community - the BS, BS and BU polling districts of the present Falconwood Ward. The Commission’s proposed boundary between Christchurch and Upton wards followed
part of the main shopping street (The Broadway) then
dived south. Nowhere else did the Commission recognise
this main road as a natural boundary. The Council's
claim of a natural boundary coming about through the
redevelopment of the Bexleyheath Central Area was
grossly exaggerated. This was subject to the findings
of a public inquiry which had not yet reported. The
national and local economic situation made any redevelopment
most likely to be on a far more modest scale than
previously envisaged and the commercial redevelopment was
unlikely to occur before the early 1990's. The Liberal
scheme was a genuine attempt to identify the local
communities and their environs - such as Hillsgrove, Hill
View, East Wickham, Little Danson, Crook Log and Clock
Tower etc. New boundaries were more meaningful than those
of the Commission because they would be more easily
identifiable to the local electorate. The ratio of
electors to councillors in the proposed wards comfortably
met the Commission's minimum requirement of 2,500 electors
per councillor, except for the proposed Falconwood Ward
where the difference was so small as to be within the
margin of the statistical error. He thought that the
names of the wards were also important as they gave local
identification by its use of commonly accepted local
descriptions e.g. particularly Crook Log, Clock Tower,
Danson and Hillsgrove. He felt that the Labour proposals
for the Falconwood and Upton wards were unnecessarily
clumsy but he would prefer the Labour plan for Christchurch
ward to that of the Commission.

37. Councillor Hargrave (Labour) commented:—

(1) He did not believe that in Bexleyheath there existed
really distinctive communities. That being so, and given
the views he had already expressed on one member wards,
he could see no justification for a one member
Falconwood ward.

(2) His criticism of the draft proposals for Bexleyheath
was that they failed to take advantage of the revision
to establish sound boundaries along main roads.
In detail:

(i) the north-eastern boundary of the Danson ward
was a back street, Clifton Road. Apparently this
kind of boundary was not acceptable in Belvedere
but was in Danson. The central area of the
eastern boundary, instead of following the main
Danson Road, meandered across Danson Park and then ran
round the back of Danson Mead.

(ii) The Christchurch ward, instead of having the main
Crook Log road as its south-westerly boundary with
the Upton ward, crossed this obvious and national
boundary and then moved in a semi-circle along
back streets until it eventually reached the
main road again.
(iii) Councillor Couchman had said that the majority party had tried to preserve well established boundaries. In fact in only three wards were the boundaries to remain unchanged.

(3) He contrasted the boundaries suggested by the Labour Party with those in the draft proposals. Their boundary between Falconwood and Danson was the main road, Hook Lane. For the north-eastern boundary between Danson and Christchurch they used the main Brampton Road, whilst Danson Road served as the convenient boundary between Danson and Upton. The boundary between Upton and Christchurch was Crook Log and the Broadway.

(4) A difficulty arose in Falconwood because under the Labour proposals the ratio of electors to councillors 224:5 was rather low. They had been influenced by the Commission's statement that numbers below 2500 would only be accepted in exceptional circumstances, so they proposed an adjustment of the boundary between Falconwood and East Wickham to avoid this difficulty by making the ratio of electors to councillors in East Wickham more satisfactory. They suggested that the main Welling Way, the A209, should be the boundary between Falconwood and East Wickham instead of the railway. The areas on each side of the railway line were linked by a footbridge and residents of both areas tended to do their shopping in the Welling High Street vicinity. This change would transfer 837 electors from East Wickham ward to Falconwood ward and produce the following result:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Projected 1981 electorate</th>
<th>Average per member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East Wickham</td>
<td>7660</td>
<td>2553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falconwood</td>
<td>5328</td>
<td>2664</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

38. Mr. W.J. Gilroy (Secretary, Bexleyheath Labour Party) said Bexleyheath was mainly a residential area. Apart from two shopping centres (Bexleyheath and Welling) there was no community life to take into consideration. Good boundaries were therefore important. He objected to 1 member wards. There was a polling station in the area north of Bellsgrove Road.

39. Mr. R.A. Frey, O.B.E. (Secretary, Bexleyheath Conservative Association) commented he had been Secretary for more than 27 years. This was the third inquiry into local ward boundaries during that period. The Bexleyheath
constituency ward boundaries had been very satisfactory and non-controversial since they were established by the original Borough of Bexley over 20 years ago. The inequalities of representation in the Upton and Falconwood wards arose not from bad planning originally, but because upon the formation of the present London Borough of Bexley some 14 years ago parts of those two wards lying south of the A2 road were transferred to Sidcup. What had originally been equal 3-councillor wards became unequal 2-councillor wards, hence the present need for change. The only mistake in the original boundaries was that a row of houses on the west side of Danson Road were cut off from their natural affinity with houses on the opposite side of the road and became part of a ward from which they were separated by the wide and uninhabited Danson Park. This had been corrected in the Commission's proposals but had not been corrected in the Labour Party's proposals. The changes necessary to balance the inequalities in Upton and Falconwood wards were most sensible. Upton had been brought up to a 3-councillor ward by the addition of a polling district from Christchurch; this polling district had roads which ran into Upton ward, while it lay south of Bexleyheath Broadway, the growing traffic, railings etc. of which make a natural boundary separating it from other parts of Christchurch ward. Christchurch had been compensated by part of a polling district from Danson which included the row of houses in Danson Road already mentioned. Danson was compensated by a polling district from Falconwood, adjacent to it and which had probably more affinity to Danson than to Falconwood. The truncated Falconwood ward that remained became a genuine 1-councillor ward, centering as it did on The Green, Welling and the Church and Falconwood Community Centre situated there. The whole result of the Commission's Draft Proposals, therefore, had been to bring Bexleyheath more equality in ward representation and at the same time to maintain the long established identities and communities of the present wards with the least possible disturbance.

40. Councillor Croom (Conservative) made the following criticisms:-

(1) Labour Scheme

The Labour Party in their submission on the Commission's proposals had stated "It cannot be said that ward boundaries in this constituency, both present and proposed, cut across community ties. Our objection to the draft proposals for this area is that they fail to take advantage of the revision to establish sound boundary lines along the main roads". The Labour Party then proceeded to suggest wholesale changes to the existing ward boundaries.
south of the railway and to increase Upton Ward to 3 members and reduce Christchurch to 2 members. All of these changes resulted in many community ties being broken. More important, these changes did nothing to overcome the one imperfection in the existing ward structure which gave rise to the need for any changes at all e.g. that Labour’s plan would still leave the Falconwood ward a little too small and the Upton Ward a little too large, viz:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Falconwood</td>
<td>4624</td>
<td>2627.6</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>4491</td>
<td>2660.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Upton</td>
<td>9215</td>
<td>2627.6</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>8912</td>
<td>2660.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the Commission felt that this imbalance was acceptable there was no reason to change the existing ward structure at all. The existing boundaries were perfectly satisfactory and the wholesale changes affecting so many areas as suggested by Labour to place them along different main roads were unnecessary. If, however, the Commission felt that it was reasonable to even-up the Falconwood/Upton electorates having regard to the fact that a reasonable alternative was available then the draft proposals, which satisfactorily embodied communities, provided the correct solution.

(2) The Liberal Scheme.

As the Liberals had set themselves against 3-member wards, the resulting necessity to divide up the area in to 2 and 1 member wards entirely, coupled with an apparent belief that a major shopping centre (e.g. Bexleyheath Broadway) was in itself a community had led to a scheme which destroyed all existing wards, divided what were in fact residential communities and devised many incomprehensible boundaries. The reason for the shape of some wards (e.g. Upton) was not understood. He could not believe that such proposals were likely to be further considered as being in any way more realistic than the Commission’s draft proposals.
Councillor F. Prearley (Conservative - St. Mary's ward) said he had lived in Bexley for 46 years and made a long statement (a copy of which is set out in Appendix 7) explaining in detail the reasons for the Council's scheme for this constituency. Growth of population had made it necessary to change substantially the structure of the existing wards and to increase their number. The Council had related ward sizes to communities as they had let the area fall naturally into certain communities which were mostly identifiable by physical features on the ground. He criticised the Labour and Liberal schemes on the following grounds:

(1) Labour Scheme.

(i) To allot only 19 members in a 62 member authority to the Sidcup area was unfair on Sidcup residents. 19 members were appropriate. As substantial parts of the area still contained low-density housing, the private re-development of recent years was likely to continue.

(ii) In some cases, strong, well-established and easily identifiable existing ward boundaries had been abolished to enable not well related communities to be 'incorporated' into the same ward e.g. the proposed ward boundary of the Sidcup East ward extended north of the railway line to include the Canterbury Avenue/Hurst Road/ Poetsway Lane triangle which had little physical or community connection with the area south of the railway line and broke substantial existing community ties.

(iii) Some proposed ward boundaries appeared to have been fixed in a haphazard fashion without identifying communities e.g., in the proposed Lamorbey East ward the northern end of the western boundary divided the community of Blackfen; and the southern end of the western boundary divided the local community of Brookend/Longmeadow.

(iv) The proposals failed to recognise Poetsway as a community in its own right and maintained the separation of the area to the east of the River Cray from the area to the west.

(v) The physical shape of some of the proposed wards with a number of the new proposed boundaries not being readily identifiable on the ground would create considerable local confusion.

(vi) Residents of the proposed "Royal Park" ward shopped and used the community facilities around Sidcup High Street; the catchment area of the
Royal Park junior school extended westwards to Birchwood Avenue and beyond to include the whole of Faraday Avenue; and the St. Andrews Church Parish extended to Birchwood Avenue with community links centred on Parklands Schools and the clinic in Wren Road. There was no reason for the separation of this area from its established position in the Sidcup East ward with which it formed part of a continuous urban development.

(2) The Liberal Scheme

(1) Many of the proposed wards divided existing communities e.g., the proposals for Blackfen, Blendon and Ivermore wards divided between them a residential area built as one estate and community around Sherwood Park Avenue, Ramillies Road and Rowley Avenue. He did not accept that a community necessarily consisted of or centred around a shopping centre. He felt that in the case of the larger shopping centres, e.g., Blackfen, the shopping centre itself separated the communities to the east and west. He saw no reason whatsoever for dividing the established existing wards of Sidcup East and West. The proposed Cray ward was unsatisfactory on community grounds because North Cray and the area around Frognal Place were unrelated communities, Footscray Meadows were separated from Footscray and the entire area created a proposed ward of many complexities which was geographically unnecessarily large.

(11) Many of the proposed ward boundaries were not readily identifiable on the ground as they cut between properties and some might not prove permanent. This could cause local confusion.

Councillor Hargrave (Labour) complained that it had been difficult to follow such a long and detailed statement and he did not propose to answer it in detail. His own comments on the proposals for this constituency were:

(1) North Cray and Coldblow.

(1) The draft proposals of the Commission forsook the well defined boundary of the River Cray and instead divided the well-knit community of North Cray along the middle of a row of shops serving the entire community. This was done to create a 1-member Footscray ward which had little basis in community distinctiveness and electoral history.
(ii) Some might disagree and argue that Footscray was a separate community but even if that was so what justification could there be for dividing one community in order to recognize the somewhat dubious claims of another? He did not dispute that there were links between North Cray and Footscray, but the links between the two parts of North Cray were far greater and ought to be preserved.

(iii) Between North Cray and Goldblow there are no links whatsoever. He did not accept that two areas, widely separated, were united by their common rural character. The two areas were essentially urban in character though surrounded by open country. Moreover, the proposed boundary of the ward was the proposed route of a road which might never be built and certainly not before 1990.

(iv) The Goldblow area was somewhat isolated and, had the projected electorate for 1981 justified it, there might well be a case for a separate 1 member Goldblow ward. But as they did not there was everything to be said for maintaining the links with Bexley Village rather than joining it to an area with which it had nothing in common.

(2) (1) The proposal to establish a North Cray and Goldblow ward had implications that went beyond that area. Given the Commission's objection to 4 member wards, the obvious and natural division of the St Mary's ward was into a Bexley Village ward and Blendon ward. But once the Council had disposed of Goldblow it was prevented by numbers from making such a sensible division.

(ii) Instead the Blendon area had been split between a 3-member St Mary's ward and a 3-member Blendon and Penhill ward. The very name of the latter was something of a misnomer because only 2331 electors would come from the Blendon area compared with 4336 from the present Lamorbey East ward.

(iii) Thus not only was the Blendon area divided in an unacceptable manner but so too only more so was the Lamorbey East ward. Its largest area was to be joined across the obvious boundary of the Penhill roundabouts, and across a former constituency and local government boundary with part of Blendon. Not only did the Labour Party find this objectionable, so too did the Lamorbey East Residents Association.
Councillor Brearley had argued that the shops on each side of the roundabout were used by residents from both sides of the present boundary. If this was a serious contention in the cases of two separated shopping parades, how could it be denied in the case of North Cray where it was proposed to draw a boundary through the middle of a row of shops?

(3) For the Bexley area he believed the present St. Mary's ward divided conveniently and naturally into two areas, blondon and Old Bexley with two 2 member wards. The Labour Party had also tried to preserve the Lamorbey area on the basis of the well established Lamorbey East and West wards, which could be achieved by an adjustment between the wards along well defined boundary lines. To ensure a satisfactory ratio between electors and councillors in the two wards it was proposed to transfer the Hurst Road area of the present Lamorbey East ward to the Sidcup East ward. There was good reason there for not using the railway as a boundary. The Hurst Road area was isolated from the main part of Lamorbey by public open space and by a golf course. Its links were mainly with Sidcup rather than Blackfen, with both the Green Line and 229 bus services linking the area not to Blackfen but to Sidcup. The addition of the Hurst Road area to Sidcup East would produce an unduly large 3 member ward unless an adjustment was made elsewhere. There was a very strong case for creating a 1 member Royal Park ward. The boundaries were clearly defined and the area had not been associated with Sidcup East until the establishment of the London Borough, being formerly part of North Cray ward though isolated from North Cray geographically. The area was a community of its own, having its own school, shopping centre, church, youth club and railway station.

(4) The Labour Party's proposal to maintain the present North Cray ward would avoid the division of the community into different wards.

Mr. F. Gilroy (Labour) questioned the 1981 projection for this constituency and in particular for Footscray.

Mr. J. Tremayne, from Sidcup East, asked for Oxford Road to be in Sidcup East with the following effect:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1981 electorate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sidcup East</td>
<td>8626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Oxford Road</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footscray</td>
<td>3108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Oxford Road</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3050</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr. Alford (for the Council) explained that the 1981 projection showed a decline because it was expected that the occupancy rate would decrease. The 1977 register did not include the Footscray Phase 2B development.

Councillor Miss E. Rhodes (Labour - North Cray ward) said it was essential to get North Cray in perspective. It was a commuter area on the edge of the green belt. Those working in rural activities there would come from Ellenborough Road. There were two market gardens and a small farm in the area. She had never been criticised for failing to represent her constituents. People from all parts of North Cray took part in the activities of North Cray. To exclude Ellenborough Road from the ward for North Cray would destroy the stability of the North Cray community. The River Cray was the natural boundary. Coldblow and North Cray were not likely to work together. She objected to North Cray and Coldblow being joined.

Councillor Hargrave (Labour) supported what Councillor Miss Rhodes had said. It was wrong to join Ellenborough Road to Footscray. Neither North Cray nor Coldblow were really rural areas; the latter was a compact estate. Travel between the two meant leaving the ward proposed by the Commission. He doubted the wisdom of using the site of the proposed by-pass as a boundary. Coldblow was isolated and would justify a 1 member ward on its own but was no longer. It did not justify a separate ward.

Mr. D. Browne (Liberal) said:

1. the prospective by-pass boundary ignored the existing by-pass.
2. most of Footscray was in the green belt.

There were three communities - Coldblow, North Cray and Footscray. He suggested North Cray and Footscray should be joined in a 2 member ward called Cray. Coldblow should be in St. Mary's ward. He objected to the exclusion of Ellenborough Road from the ward for North Cray, which had been done purely on a class basis. The existing ward plus Footscray should be retained.

Mr. Standen (Liberal) who lived in Coldblow, said Coldblow was regarded as part of Bexley Village.

Mrs. D. Boothman, who lived in the St. James Garden development, said she had not noticed any difference between that and Ellenborough Road, which was part of North Cray. Quite a few of the children from St. James Garden went to the Church school or to Royal Parade.
The by-pass would not be built before 1991.

Mr. J.C. Peacock, of 12 St. James Way, on behalf of the North Grey Ratepayers Association believed North Grey should keep its identity. He agreed at the outset with the Commission's proposals, except that Ruxley Close should be with North Grey. He could see little identity of North Grey with Ellenborough Road, which leaned towards Footscray. Under the Labour and Liberal plans, North Grey would lose its identity. He agreed with what had been said about Coldblow.

46. Councillor Hargrave (Labour) repeated his opposition to the Commission's proposals. In reply to a question by me he expressed his unwillingness and inability to consider revising the Labour scheme to provide 19 councillors for Sidcup constituency. He pointed out that the average electors per councillor for each of the three constituencies were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constituency</th>
<th>Commission's Proposals</th>
<th>Labour Scheme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Erith and Crayford</td>
<td>2702</td>
<td>2595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bexleyheath</td>
<td>2665</td>
<td>2665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidcup</td>
<td>2583</td>
<td>2732</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

and added that the north of the Borough was where most problems - social and environmental - existed.

47. Councillor Jones (Conservative) was equally unwilling to see a scheme which provided 18 members for Sidcup. He pointed out that the entitlement for Erith and Crayford constituency was less than 24 in 1977. The Council had taken account of firm proposals for new development - e.g. in Thamesmead East.

48. Mr. Gilroy (Labour) commented on the Commission's proposals as follows:

(1) **Footscray.** Footscray Ward was contrary to the Commission's rules. The North Cray ward was being arbitrarily broken up to form part of this proposed new ward; even the North Cray school came within its orbit. A perfect existing boundary of the River Cray was being changed to one which ran between a row of shops and down the back fences of rows of houses. The electorate of the proposed Footscray ward was now 3367 and would rise to about 3530 with houses at present under construction, giving a variation under the proposals of 2453 electors per councillor in the proposed Blendon and Penhill Ward, and 3530 in the...
proposed Footscray ward, a range of difference of no less than 1077. Footscray had long been only a polling district, at one time part of a Frugal ward, then a Birchwood ward, in the former Chislehurst and Sidcup U.D.C., and then part of Sidcup East ward in the London Borough of Bexley.

(2) Bexley area. The Bexley area, at present covered by the St. Mary's ward was also being broken up without regard to local ties. The Coldblow area had always been associated with Old Bexley, not only under the London Borough of Bexley, but also under the former Bexley Borough Council. It was impossible to conceive a community of interest between the residents of Coldblow and those of the Maidstone Road/Bexley area. The boundary was along an at present non-existent road, which might or might not be constructed; the present possible construction date being as far ahead as 1990.

(3) Lamorbey area. There could be no justification for the arbitrary division of the Lamorbey area and fragmentation of part of the Bexley area. It was easy to maintain the Lamorbey area almost as a whole and preserve the well established Lamorbey East and West wards, with an adjustment between the two wards along well-defined boundary lines. To equate the electorates only a small area needed to be taken away, and the Hurst Road area presented an ideal solution. This Hurst Road area was separated from the main part of Lamorbey by the public open space and golf course. Its links were mainly with Sidcup, the residents gravitated towards Sidcup High Street rather than Blackfen, and both the Green line service and the 229 bus route through the area went into Sidcup East and thence to Sidcup High Street.

(4) Sidcup East. With the addition of Hurst Road P.D., the Sidcup East ward would be too large, but again there was an ideal solution. Polling districts SM and SQ formed an ideal one councillor ward. The boundaries were clearly defined, the area was not connected with Sidcup East until the formation of the London Borough of Bexley, being formerly part of the North Cray ward. It had its own school, shopping centre, and youth club, and railway station.

He continued that the approach road should not disturb the existing wards more than necessary. The Council's scheme had caused conflict - Polling districts SU, SY and SW should be in Blendon ward and SK, ST and SZ in Old Bexley ward. Ellenborough Road should be with North Cray. Polling districts SM and SQ should be in Royal Park ward - Lamorbey should be split.
Councillor Tremayne (Conservative) said that the strength of the Footscray community should be recognised. There was a local plan for it. It was a stronger community than the Labour Party's Royal Park ward. The Council's boundary at Ellenborough Road followed the polling district boundary. The area north of the railway was separated from Sidcup East.

Councillor Jones (Conservative) said that, in the interests of fairness to all political parties, the Council had looked at sensitive political areas strictly in accordance with the Commission's guidelines. He contended that this was shown by a comparison of the Council's Blackfen, Blendon and Penhill, and Iamorbey wards with the Labour Party's scheme for that area.

Councillor H.K.Davis (Labour) thought that a fresh start should be made with the St.Mary's ward. The Dorchester Avenue and Murchison Avenue area was a community on its own and had nothing to do with Old Bexley.
Competing Schemes

Three general schemes were before the meeting. The Commission's proposals (based on the Council's scheme which had been prepared by the Conservative group), the Labour Party's scheme and the Liberal Association's scheme. They provide varying memberships in the three parliamentary constituencies in this London Borough as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constituency</th>
<th>Commission</th>
<th>Labour</th>
<th>Liberal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Erith and Crayford</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bexleyheath</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidcup</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>62</strong></td>
<td><strong>62</strong></td>
<td><strong>62</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

53. The electorates for the constituencies, on the latest figures supplied by the Council, are

Electorates and Entitlements

Commission's proposals and Labour Scheme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Erith &amp; Crayford</td>
<td>62,005</td>
<td>23.51</td>
<td>64,470</td>
<td>24.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bexleyheath</td>
<td>51,368</td>
<td>19.49</td>
<td>50,780</td>
<td>19.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidcup</td>
<td>50,101</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>42,170</td>
<td>18.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>163,474</strong></td>
<td><strong>62.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>164,420</strong></td>
<td><strong>62.99</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Liberal Scheme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Erith &amp; Crayford</td>
<td>62,005</td>
<td>23.89</td>
<td>64,470</td>
<td>24.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bexleyheath</td>
<td>51,368</td>
<td>19.76</td>
<td>50,780</td>
<td>19.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidcup</td>
<td>50,101</td>
<td>15.35</td>
<td>42,170</td>
<td>18.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>163,474</strong></td>
<td><strong>63.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>164,420</strong></td>
<td><strong>63.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The average number of electors for the different totals of membership are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Borough Members</th>
<th>Erith &amp; Crayford Members</th>
<th>Bexleyheath Members</th>
<th>Sidcup Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>2637</td>
<td>2595</td>
<td>2439</td>
<td>2507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>2652</td>
<td>2610</td>
<td>2636</td>
<td>2579</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The variations among the entitlements and average electorate per councillor shown by the figures reveal that there will be unevenness among the constituencies, whichever pattern of membership be adopted. If the members for the Borough number 62:

(a) 25 members for Erith and Crayford would not be justified but

(b) Sidcup would be markedly over-represented by 19 members but even more significantly under-represented by 18 members.

If the total for the Borough were 63:

(i) 25 members for Erith and Crayford and 19 for Sidcup would not be unreasonable but

(ii) Bexleyheath would be seriously under-represented by 19.

It seems to me that, unless constituency boundaries are to be crossed by some new wards, disparity of representation among the constituencies will have to be accepted. The Commission are not bound to observe constituency boundaries, but nobody at the meeting suggested departing from them and one Liberal ward was criticised (wrongly it seems) for crossing a constituency boundary. I have a strong impression that local feeling is against crossing these boundaries. I therefore examined the three schemes to see which could fairly be said to produce the least disparity.

The Labour scheme provides for a total of 62 members. On that figure, the entitlement for Erith and Crayford in 1981 is 24.31 and for Sidcup 18.53. The Commission's proposals of 22 members for the former and 19 for the latter are closer to the 1981 entitlements than the Labour scheme of 25 and 18 respectively. On the 1977 figures, even 24 for Erith and Crayford is an over-representation, while 19 is exactly right for Sidcup. In the circumstances I feel I have no option but to prefer the Commission's proposals in this respect.
The Liberal's scheme provides for a total of 63 members, with 25 for Erith and Crayford and 19 for Sidcup. The 1981 entitlements for a total of 63 made these figures reasonable although Bexleyheath with 19 is under-represented to almost the same degree as Sidcup is over-represented in the Commission's proposals. However, my view is that it is necessary to consider the Liberal's scheme as a whole - it deliberately sets out to identify small communities and to provide 1 and 2 member wards. In this respect, it compares with the other two schemes as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme</th>
<th>No. of Wards</th>
<th>3 Member</th>
<th>2 Member</th>
<th>1 Member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commission</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labour</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both the Conservative and Labour speakers preferred 3 or 2 member wards because a 1 member ward might suffer if the member be for any reason unable to attend to his Council work and 2 or 3 members among them serve on more committees than 1 member would; thus placing a wider range of detailed knowledge of the Council's work at the disposal of their constituents. In my opinion there is force in this argument against 1 member wards at any rate in a London Borough, although of course, such a ward could be justified there in special circumstances. Also the Liberals' concept of a community (mainly based on an area served by a primary school) was challenged at the meeting. In many cases, the identification of a community area is a matter of subjective opinion. Generally speaking I feel that in a largely built-up London Borough it is difficult to affirm with universal acceptance that any particular area is certainly a self-contained community. In my opinion, a re-warding exercise becomes necessary only because the electorates of existing wards have ceased to have a reasonable parity among them. The object should be to cause the least practicable disturbance of what the electors have become accustomed to. It is not really an opportunity to tear up existing patterns and start afresh, which is what it seems to me the Liberals are trying to do with their scheme. For these reasons I prefer not to use their scheme as the basis for considering what is the best pattern of wards for this London Borough.

The speaker for the Labour party was not willing to consider revising the Labour scheme to provide 19 members for Sidcup, any more than the Conservative speaker would amend the proposals he preferred to provide 25 members for Erith and Crayford and 18 for Sidcup. From the conclusions I have reached in the preceding two paragraphs, it follows that I
will use the Commission's proposals as the base against which to consider the discussion at the meeting.

Criticism of Individual Wards

Erith and Crayford Constituency

57. The main criticisms of the Commission's proposals for this constituency were:

(1) Part of Belvedere had been included in Thamesmead East ward as its south-eastern corner;

(2) The Manor Road area had been separated from Erith and;

(3) The provision of two wards for Northumberland Heath and Parsonage where one ward for these two areas was preferable.

58. Belvedere. The figures for the Commission's Belvedere ward and the effect of extending it to include the area in Thamesmead East are

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belvedere Ward</td>
<td>7681</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>8070</td>
<td>3.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>add area</td>
<td>721</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>3.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thamesmead East Ward</td>
<td>6911</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>8790</td>
<td>3.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>remove area</td>
<td>721</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>3.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table shows that while the Commission's proposals for 1977 provides for better parity between the two wards, in 1981 there is little difference in the relation between the electorates of the two wards with or without the change suggested at the meeting. From what I heard at the meeting, the area in question is not regarded as part of Thamesmead; it is in the existing Belvedere ward. In my opinion therefore (using the Commission's proposals as a basis) it seems desirable to add the area to their Belvedere ward, notwithstanding the great over-representation of Thamesmead East ward in 1977 which would ensue. It has to be remembered that the 1981 figures are more important than those for 1977 and that each year between 1977 and 1981...
the over-representation will be reduced until in 1981 its representation will be 0.05 less than it is entitled to; whereas, were the Commission's proposal to be left unaltered, it would be under-represented by 0.32. It is true that Belvedere ward will then be under-represented in 1981 by 0.31. In other words Thamesmead East's under-representation will have been transferred to Belvedere by the change, but Belvedere will gain by not having part of its community split off from it.

Manor Road area. This area presents a real problem. From what I heard at the meeting, the residents certainly have all their ties with Erith and its town centre but few with Slade Green. Both the Labour Party and the Liberal Associations included Manor Road with Erith in their schemes, but only by devising differently planned other wards which produced a total of 25 councillors for this constituency, which as I have already shown is in my opinion one too many. I have tried to work out an alternative pattern by including Manor Road in with Erith ward by moving the western boundary to the east; but, because of the domino effect on the other wards, have reached the conclusion that this is an instance where the search for parity among the wards must have priority and Manor Road must stay where it is. The Erith ward, in which it is, has a very good representation both in 1977 and 1981.

Northumberland Heath and Parsonage wards. After hearing the arguments at the meeting it seems to me that the interests of these two wards fall very much together. I found it difficult to accept the argument advanced for separating them. There should therefore be only one ward called Northumberland Heath, returning 3 councillors. The figures are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1977</th>
<th>1981</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Electorate</td>
<td>Entitlement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Heath</td>
<td>5451</td>
<td>2.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parsonage</td>
<td>2719</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>8170</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I have carefully considered the arguments for changing some of the other wards proposed by the Commission for this constituency, particularly Barnehurst and Barnehurst North, but am not convinced that any further change is required.
Bexleyheath Constituency

62. The Labour Party agreed there were no strong community divisions in Bexleyheath, but criticised the Commission's proposals because the ward boundaries were not as good as those in the Labour Party's scheme. In my opinion, the Labour boundaries may be slightly better but their scheme provides a less degree of parity among the wards, in 1981. The Liberal Associations, on the other hand, in addition to criticising those boundaries, claimed to have tried to relate local communities to their wards. I have given in paragraph 55 my reasons for not preferring the Liberal's scheme. Therefore I see no convincing reason to amend the Commission's proposals for this constituency.

Sidcup Constituency

63. As I have previously shown, the figures made 19 the appropriate representation for Sidcup. The Labour Party's scheme for 18 councillors cannot be readily adapted to provide for 19 members. The Liberals provide for 19 members by nine 2 member wards and one 1 member ward. The Commission's proposals provide for five 3-member wards, one 2 member ward and two 1 member wards. I believe the Commission's pattern to be preferable in a London Borough.

64. During the discussion, one minor point and one major point arose particularly. The minor point related to Oxford Road, along the centre of which the boundary between the Commission's Sidcup East ward and Footscray ward runs. It seemed to be generally agreed that both sides of the road should be in Sidcup East ward. The effect on the electorate would be:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sidcup East</td>
<td>8724</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>8630</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add East side of Oxford Road</td>
<td>8772</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>8678</td>
<td>3.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footscray</td>
<td>3389</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>3110</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove east side of Oxford Road</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3341</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>3158</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This change seems to be to be reasonable.

The major point affects the Commission's St. Mary's, North Cray and Coldblow, and Footscray wards. First, it was strongly argued in some quarters that Coldblow was part of Old Bexley (in St. Mary's ward) and had no connection with North Cray. Second, it was equally strongly argued that it was wrong to separate the Ellenborough Road area from the rest of North Cray and that to do so smacked of class distinction. Against these points, there were many written representations and some speeches at the meeting contending that both North Cray and Coldblow are rural areas which should jointly have one councillor to represent their special interests. Doubt was cast at the meeting in this connection, as it was pointed out that Coldblow is a compact residential area. Moreover most of the workers on the small farm and the two market gardens in the North Cray and Coldblow ward came from the Ellenborough Road area which is outside that ward. To my mind, it is an exaggeration to speak of Coldblow and North Cray as a rural area in the sense in which the term would be understood in the counties outside London. Consequently the case for one councillor concerned solely with their interests is over-stated and could be outweighed by what I regard as the inherent defects of a 1 member ward in a London Borough.

In my opinion the criticisms in the last paragraph are justified. The solution which would, I believe, satisfy the critics would be for Coldblow to be added to St. Mary's ward and for North Cray and Footscray to be joined in one ward. The electorates resulting from this change would be:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St. Mary's</td>
<td>7464</td>
<td></td>
<td>7410</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add Coldblow</td>
<td>1183</td>
<td>8647</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footscray</td>
<td>3389</td>
<td></td>
<td>3110</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add North Cray</td>
<td>1336</td>
<td></td>
<td>14.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4725</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>4545</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Oxford Road (See par. 64)</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4677</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>4497</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(2) **Sidcup Constituency**

(a) That Coldblow as comprised in the existing polling district SZ be included in the Commission's proposed St. Mary's ward.

(b) That the remainder of the Commission's proposed North Cray and Coldblow ward be united with their proposed Footscray ward to be known as Cray ward, returning 2 councillors.

(c) That the eastern side of Oxford Road (proposed by the Commission to be in their Footscray ward) be transferred to the Commission's proposed Sidcup East ward.

(3) That the remainder of the Commission's proposals be adopted.

69. The Commission's proposals as amended

(1) to give effect to my recommendations and

(2) to take account of the latest figures supplied by the Council's Officers

are set out in Appendix 8.

Appendix 9 sets out consequential amendments in the ward descriptions.

**Conclusion**

70. Finally, I would like first to pay tribute to the painstaking way in which the written representations were made and the helpful way in which various speakers explained them at the meeting and others made their points; and second, to thank the Chief Executive, the Director of Administration and their staff for so readily supplying the additional information for which I asked.

9th June 1977
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North End</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8093</td>
<td>7850</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>2.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnshurst</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4364</td>
<td>4310</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>1.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnshurst North</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3236</td>
<td>2990</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crayford</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7701</td>
<td>7790</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>2.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erith</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7743</td>
<td>8730</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>3.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northumberland Heath</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5451</td>
<td>5310</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parsonage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2719</td>
<td>2620</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belvedere</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7681</td>
<td>8070</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>3.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thamesmead East</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6911</td>
<td>8790</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>3.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bostall</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7606</td>
<td>7520</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>2.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Wickham</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8571</td>
<td>3500</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Michael's</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8118</td>
<td>8040</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brampton</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8176</td>
<td>7900</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>2.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7954</td>
<td>8060</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>3.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falconwood</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2783</td>
<td>2800</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danson</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7628</td>
<td>7520</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upton</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8133</td>
<td>7960</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
<td><strong>51369</strong></td>
<td><strong>50780</strong></td>
<td><strong>19.49</strong></td>
<td><strong>19.15</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lambeth</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7607</td>
<td>7500</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackfen</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5192</td>
<td>5050</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brendon &amp; Perhill</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7469</td>
<td>7290</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Cray &amp; Coldblow</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2519</td>
<td>2610</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidcup East</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3724</td>
<td>8630</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feetscray</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2389</td>
<td>3110</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidcup West</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7737</td>
<td>7570</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>2.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Mary's</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7464</td>
<td>7410</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
<td><strong>50101</strong></td>
<td><strong>49170</strong></td>
<td><strong>19.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>18.53</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total for Borough</td>
<td><strong>62</strong></td>
<td><strong>163,474</strong></td>
<td><strong>164,420</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average per Councillor</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2,657</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,652</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward</td>
<td>No. of Councillors</td>
<td>1975 Electorate</td>
<td>1931 Electorate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Entitlement</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Entitlement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crayford North</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7280</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>7450</td>
<td>2.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crayford West</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7443</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>7450</td>
<td>2.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crayford Town</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7450</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>7500</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erith Town</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8114</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>8300</td>
<td>3.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Heath</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8003</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>7950</td>
<td>2.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belvedere South</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5306</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>5620</td>
<td>2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belvedere North</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4431</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>4750</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thamesmead East</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6183</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>6100</td>
<td>3.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bostall</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7242</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>6750</td>
<td>3.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>62349</td>
<td>23.73</td>
<td>64470</td>
<td>24.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Wickham</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3134</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>3500</td>
<td>3.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Michael's</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3170</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>3.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brampton</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3171</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>7550</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4634</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>4500</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falconwood</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7659</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>7700</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donson</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9615</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>8900</td>
<td>3.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upont</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5943</td>
<td>19.35</td>
<td>50730</td>
<td>19.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>50943</td>
<td>19.35</td>
<td>50730</td>
<td>19.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orpombev East</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8148</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>8100</td>
<td>3.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orpombev West</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2280</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>8060</td>
<td>3.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Cray</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2934</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>2850</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Park</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2823</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>2760</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidcup East</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8645</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>8620</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidcup West</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7552</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>7570</td>
<td>2.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eton</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5881</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>5390</td>
<td>2.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Bexley</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5275</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>5230</td>
<td>1.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>49621</td>
<td>18.09</td>
<td>49170</td>
<td>19.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total for Borough</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>162,913</td>
<td>164,420</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average per Councillor</td>
<td>2,623</td>
<td>2,652</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 2

The Liberal Association's Scheme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>No. of Councillors</th>
<th><strong>1975 Electorate</strong></th>
<th><strong>1981 Electorate</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thamesmead Abbey</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2323 0.90</td>
<td>2300 0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thamesmead Lakeside</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3860 1.49</td>
<td>5800 2.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesnes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4753 1.84</td>
<td>4660 1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bostall</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5024 1.94</td>
<td>4860 1.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hythe</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2573 1.00</td>
<td>2440 0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northumberland Heath</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5416 2.10</td>
<td>5210 2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnhurst</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5070 1.96</td>
<td>4900 1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grayford West</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2329 0.90</td>
<td>2210 0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grayford Town</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4545 1.91</td>
<td>5360 2.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slade Green</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5005 1.94</td>
<td>4840 1.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erith</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4036 1.93</td>
<td>4740 1.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frans Park</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2876 1.11</td>
<td>4470 1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5290 2.05</td>
<td>5570 2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normandy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2582 1.00</td>
<td>2670 1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belvedere Village</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2715 1.05</td>
<td>4240 1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>6234.9</td>
<td>24.11</td>
<td>6470 24.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hill View</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5388 2.08</td>
<td>5750 2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Wickham</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5339 2.07</td>
<td>5240 2.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillsgrove</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2747 1.06</td>
<td>2650 1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Michael's</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5386 2.03</td>
<td>5200 1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brompton</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5615 2.17</td>
<td>5440 2.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clock Tower</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5156 1.99</td>
<td>5130 1.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upton</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5457 2.11</td>
<td>5590 2.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crook Log</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5275 2.04</td>
<td>5430 2.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denson</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5470 2.12</td>
<td>5350 2.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falconwood</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5110 1.98</td>
<td>4950 1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>50943 19.70</td>
<td></td>
<td>50780 19.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

continued .......
### Appendix 3 (continued)....

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>No. of Councillors</th>
<th>1975 Electorate Total Entitlement</th>
<th>1981 Electorate Total Entitlement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St. Mary's</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5335</td>
<td>5380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5355</td>
<td>5300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longlands</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4753</td>
<td>4830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidcup Central</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5854</td>
<td>5690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Park</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4774</td>
<td>4790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyndham</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5042</td>
<td>4870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackfen</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5932</td>
<td>5850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesnorbey</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4954</td>
<td>5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mendon</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4717</td>
<td>4610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albany Park</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2901</td>
<td>2850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total for Borough</strong></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
<td><strong>49621</strong></td>
<td><strong>49170</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average per Councillor

| Total for Borough     | 63                 | 162,913                           | 164,420                           |
| Average per Councillor|                    | 2,586                             | 2,610                             |
APPENDIX 4

ASSESSMENT OF THE 1981 ELECTORATE

1.1 The two components used for assessing the 1981 electorate are:

(a) The estimated dwelling stock available at October 1970 (the qualifying date for the 1981 Electoral Register).

(b) The estimated number of electors per dwelling at the same date.

1.2 The resultant estimates are multiplied to arrive at the projected electorate for 1981.

1.3 To calculate the estimated dwelling stock and the number of electors per dwelling at October 1980, the following methodology was used:

(a) The estimated dwelling stock available in proposed wards.

Initially, the estimated dwelling stock, at October 1974, of existing wards was calculated by the addition of the dwellings enumerated at the 1971 census and dwellings completed from that date (April 1971) to October 1974.

To arrive at an estimate of the dwelling stock contained within proposed wards at that date it was first necessary to calculate an occupancy factor for existing wards by dividing the number of electors by the dwelling stock and then, where proposed ward boundaries differed from existing wards, the occupancy factors were estimated by interpreting the occupancy factors of the component parts of existing wards.

The occupancy factor by proposed ward was then divided into the electorate in order to estimate the number of dwellings within proposed wards at October, 1974. The validity of this was checked by reference to a control total of the existing dwellings in the Borough. An estimate of the dwelling stock by proposed ward at October 1980 was then calculated from the following elements:

(i) The estimated number of dwellings at October 1974.

(ii) Residential developments completed between October 1974 - October 1975.

(iii) The Council Housing Programme to 1981.

(iv) The dwellings proposed for that part of Thamesmead contained within the Borough to 1981.

(v) Outstanding planning permissions.

(b) The estimated number of electors per dwelling at October 1980

Calculations showed a fall in the occupancy rate (electors per dwelling) between 1971 and 1975, which was a continuation of the decline in the number of persons 17 years and over per dwelling that took place between the 1961 and 1971 censuses.
The rate of decline was calculated for existing wards and an estimated occupancy rate for October 1980 was calculated. The occupancy rates for proposed wards were estimated by taking into consideration the differing occupancy rates of the component parts of existing wards.

A step-by-step outline is given below to supply a basic guide to the methodology applied.

**Step 1 - Number of electors per dwelling (occupancy rate) at October, 1971.**

By existing wards divide:

(a) The 1972 electorate (qualifying date October 1971) by

(b) The number of dwellings (1971 census) plus dwellings completed from April to October 1971.

**Step 2 - Number of electors per dwelling (occupancy rate) of existing wards at October 1974.**

By existing wards divide:

(a) The 1975 electorate (qualifying date October 1974) by

(b) The number of dwellings at October 1974 (1 b + housing completions October 1971 to October 1974).

**Step 3 - The decrease in the occupancy rate during the period October 1971 to October 1974 by existing wards**

Subtract 1974 Occupancy Rate (Step 2) from 1971 Occupancy Rate (Step 1).

**Step 4 - The estimated number of dwellings at October 1974 by proposed ward.**

By proposed wards divide:

(a) 1975 electorate (qualifying date October 1974) by

(b) the number of electors per dwelling calculated from Step 2.

**Step 5 - the estimated number of electors by proposed wards at 1981**

By proposed ward multiply:

(a) The estimated number of dwellings at October 1974 derived from Step 4 with the addition of:

(i) Dwelling completions October 1974 - October 1975

(ii) Council Housing Programme to 1981

(iii) Thamesmead Programme to 1981

(iv) Outstanding planning permissions

(b) the projected occupancy rate at October 1980, calculated from the annual average change identified in Step 3.
APPENDIX 5

Representations Received by the Commission.

1. **Bexley Borough Council** support Commission's proposals but suggest inclusion of eastern side of Oxford Road in Sidcup East ward.

2. **Bexley Labour Party** submit an alternative scheme for 24 wards (returning 62 councillors) only 4 of which are the same as wards proposed by the Commission, whose proposals they criticise as incompatible with the guidelines for boundaries and local ties.

3. **The Vicar, St. Mary's Parish Church, Bexley** contends that various roads east of Vicarage Road should be in St. Mary's ward as they have local ties with Bexley Village and he prefers either the boundary of the existing ward or that proposed by the Labour Party.

4. **Sidcup Liberal Association** object to the Commission's proposals as they cut across local ties and as an alternative propose for the Sidcup constituency 10 wards returning 19 councillors.

5. **Mr. B.M. Hepworth of 86 Palmaria Road, Bexleyheath** objects that the Commission have ignored natural boundaries and local ties.

6. **Mr. Barry Standen of 4 St. Mary's Road, Bexley** supports the Liberal Association's proposals because smaller wards based on local communities are needed.

7. **Mr. Bruce A. Taylor of 7 Hamilton Road, Bexleyheath** and **Mr. C.E. Wright of 127 Badleigh Crescent, Welling** prefer the scheme submitted on 20th February 1976 by the Bexleyheath Liberal Association as their two members will take local ties into account and give a chance for a community atmosphere to develop.

8. **Erith and Crayford Liberal Association** propose 16 wards returning 25 councillors for their constituency.

9. **North Cray Ratepayers' Association** ask for Buxley Close in the North Cray and Coldblow ward.

10. **Mr. James Wellbeloved MP** asks for the retention of:

    (1) the present boundary between Thamesmead ward and Belvedere.

    (2) the existing boundary between Erith Town ward and Slade Green (North End) ward be retained.

    (3) the existing Northumberland Heath ward.
Councillor Elver Handy and Mr. A. J. Dean of 30 Cray Road ask for the retention of the three-member Northumberland Heath ward.

Councillor Miss Elizabeth Rhodes is concerned about the proposed North Cray and Coldblow ward and criticised the separation of the Council estate and privately rented housing from a large part of owner-occupiers.

Mr. H. Bootman of 14 St. James Way, Sidcup objects to the proposed boundary change in North Cray as it cuts through the community.

Rector of North Cray Parish also objects to the division of the North Cray ward by the Commission.

Mr. D. A. Knight of 124 North Cray Road, Bexley expresses concern about the effect of the Commission's proposals on Bexley Village and North Cray and the separation of communities to the south east of Bexley Village from St. Mary's ward.

Mr. E. S. Matthews of 37 The Grove, North Cray objects to North Cray and Coldblow being in one ward.

Mr. D. A. Brodie of 50 St. James Way, North Cray objects to the existing North Cray ward being split and to the inclusion of Coldblow with North Cray.

Councillors V. A. Morgan, D. T. Enticknap and T. R. H. Lebar contend that all the Manor Road area should be in Erith ward because it is part of Erith community.

Councillor J. K. Smith (Existing Crayford North) objects to the linking of the Manor Road area with Slade Green and asks for it to be in Erith ward.

Mrs. C. A. Samuels of 115 Manor Road, Erith says her ties are with Erith not Crayford North.

Councillor J. Dawson (Thamesmead East Ward) objects to the proposed change in the boundary between Thamesmead East and Belvedere wards.

Councillor A. P. Forsyth (Belvedere ward) says many Belvedere residents consider the proposed changes in the ward boundary to be unjustified.

Mrs. Beatrice C. Scott of 20 Nelson Road, Belvedere and Mrs. D. Thompson of 2 Johnstone Cottages, Belvedere object to the proposal to cut off the area of Belvedere North of the railway line from the rest of the ward.

Mrs. B. Humphrey, Mr. G. Bull and Mrs. Odie submitted a petition with 355 signatures objecting to the proposed boundary changes in Belvedere.
28. Mr. J. Barrett of 57 King Harolds Way, Bexleyheath points out the Hurst Place Estate was transferred from Post Lane Ward to Belvedere Ward in 1964, and now it is proposed to return it with a boundary which "should meander through the woods". He suggests Woolwich Road is a better boundary.

29. Mr. E. J. Pickwood (Secretary, East Wickham Branch Labour Party) protests at the proposed new wards as they do not follow the guidelines.

30. Miss A. Cronin of 25 Leschencroft Avenue, Sidcup objects to the proposed changes as they do not take into account the necessity for a community to have stable boundaries for a considerable period if worthwhile development is to take place.

31. The Bexleyheath the Erith and Crawford and the Sidcup Liberal Associations submitted to the Commission in January or February 1976 proposals for a total of 36 one or two-member wards returning a total of 63 councillors.

32. Lt. Col. S. E. Doig C. B. E. of 20 Berton Road, North Cray supports the Commission's proposed North Cray and Coldblow wards as both places are rural communities with similar interests and problems. He believes his opinion is supported by "overwhelming majority" of the electors.

33. Mr. L. Barnes of 34 High Beeches, North Cray supports Lt. Col. Doig but suggests that North Cray and Coldblow should each have its own representative.

34. Lt. Col. Doig and Mr. Barnes were supported by:

Mrs. G. Clarke - 4 Ridgecroft Close, Bexley
Mr. R. Cooper - 69 Dartford Road, Bexley
(and 23 others)
Miss N. Cowie - 23 High Beeches
Mrs. I. M. Brandon - 15 Baldwins Park, Old Bexley
Mr. L. Beckman - 16 High Beeches, North Cray
Dr. & Mrs. Troughton (and 11 others) - 145 Tile Kiln Lane, Bexley
Mr. J. N. Harrington - 166 North Cray Road, Sidcup
Mr. G. White - Heathercroft, Coldblow
Mr. R. S. Gouda - 11 Hill Crescent, Bexley

35. Mr. Keith A. Welch of 3 Rowan Road, Bexleyheath and Mr. Bruce A. Taylor of 7 Hamilton Road, Bexleyheath supported the Liberal's proposals for Bexleyheath.
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Bexley London Borough Council

Alderman R.E. Brierly
Councillor D. Breacker
Councillor F. Bearerly
Councillor J.R. Couchman
Councillor H.K. Davis
Councillor D.J. Delaney
Councillor J. Dawson
Councillor Mrs. B. Edwards
Councillor D. Enticknap
Councillor A. Forthyth
Councillor Miss S. Seddon
Councillor E. Handy
Councillor C. Hargrove
Councillor A. Jones
Councillor T. Lebar
Councillor Minatt
Councillor C. Packer
Councillor J. Tremayne
Mr. A. Hawkes
Mr. G. Alford
Mr. F. Anderson
Miss E. Jarman
Mrs. B. Williams
Mr. R.A. Fye, O.B.E.
Mr. G. Speed
Mr. S.M. Trist
Mr. D. Browne
Mrs. S. Burstead
Mr. Goodwin
Mr. Prior

Bexley Labour Party
Erith and Crayford Labour
Conservative Association
Conservative Association
Labour Party
Belvedere Labour Party
Labour Party
I慢orby East Conservatives
Erith and Crayford Labour Party
Bexley & Belvedere Conservatives
Erith and Crayford Labour Party
Labour Party
Bexley Labour Party
Conservative
Labour Party
Conservative
Conservative
Council's Officers
Bexleyheath Conservative Association
Sidcup Conservative Association
Rexley/Sidcup Conservative Association
Liberal Associations
Sidcup Liberal Association
Erith and Crayford Liberal Association

(continued ....)
Miss Rhodes
Mr. R. Standen
Mr. C. Wright
Mr. P. Gilroy
Mr. P. Nash
Mr. Peacock

Mrs. B. Hall
Mrs. Bootman
Mr. Cuthbert
Mr. M. Green
Mr. Hatwell
Mrs. Humphrey
Mrs. Odie
Mr. Pilcher
Mr. T. Rushbrooke
Mr. N. Rushbrooke
Mrs. Samuels
Mrs. M. E. Smith
Mrs. Stutchbury
Mr. O. Butter
Mr. Saavrorrado

Liberals
Bexleyheath Liberal Association
Agent - Sidcup Labour Party
North Cray Ratepayers Association
From Belvedere
Sidcup
Erith
Bexley
Bexleyheath
Belvedere
Belvedere
Belvedere
Erith
Erith
Erith

Chessington - Labour Party.
Kentish Times.
At the present time, the Sidcup area contains 6 wards. Two of these are 4-member wards (Lamorbey West and St. Marys) and the electorate in a third (Sidcup East) has grown to an extent where it now fully justifies a 4th member. Because your Commission has indicated that wards with more than 3 members will generally be unacceptable, all Parties have found it necessary to make substantial changes to the existing structure and to increase the number of wards.

In addition, because of this, we feel that the opportunity should be taken to improve the ward structure so that it reflects communities where they are identifiable, rather than reflect, as to some extent they do at present, the historical boundaries of the old Bexley Borough Council and the old Chislehurst and Sidcup Urban District Council from both of which the present Sidcup Parliamentary Constituency drew its area.

We have felt that it is right to relate ward sizes to the communities they cover rather than devise proposals for 'all two' or 'all three' member wards as this would inevitably lead to poor boundaries and cutting of communities. Your commission's proposals for wards of 1, of 2 and of 3 members are, therefore, in accordance with our own feelings.

In preparing the scheme for submission to the Commission, it was felt that the area fell naturally into certain communities which were mostly identifiable by physical features on the ground. These communities are as follows:

**BLACKFEN/LAMORBEY/PENKILL area.** The majority of this area consists of continuous inter-war urban development with a good shopping centre at Blackfen, (which also serves part of the Eltham area in Greenwich and also the residential areas immediately to the north of the A2), and a smaller group of parades at the junctions of Blendon Road and Sherwood Park Avenue. The lines of communication are more in an east-west direction than in a north-south direction, e.g. Blendon Road - Blackfen Road, Hurst Road - Halfway Street, Old Farm Avenue, Blendon Road - Sherwood Park Avenue, etc., although there are two North-South routes, e.g. Wellington Avenue and Penkhill Road - Footscray Lane. In addition, the river Shuttle flows horizontally across the area in a West-east direction. It is considered that this river forms a convenient ward boundary in what is otherwise a mostly built up area and it so happens that its use provides for regularly shaped and easily identifiable wards with the required number of electors and relating satisfactorily to communities. It should be mentioned that, for the whole of its length, the river Shuttle is already a polling district boundary with residents to the north polling at stations to the north and residents to the south polling at stations to the south. It also happens that, for such of its length,
the river is a school catchment area boundary. In addition, it is marked by a continuous series of parks and walks along its banks which provide for some physical separation between roads. Moreover, the area to the south of the river, e.g. Old Farm Avenue/Halfway Street seems to have little to speak of in common with the area in the north around Blackfen Road. The area, therefore, falls logically into 3 wards:

Lamorbey. This regularly shaped ward contains the community between the Shuttle and the railway consisting of Old Farm Avenue, Hurst Road, Halfway Street (225 bus route) and the various roads leading off. It is similar to the former Lamorbey South ward that existed until the creation of the London Borough in 1965 when 4-member wards were introduced. With the exception of a few roads off Days Lane, the whole area is otherwise in the catchment areas of the Halfway Street Infants and Burnt Oak Lane Junior schools. The southern boundary of the railway is a very strong boundary being established as a ward boundary not only at present but also in the old Chislehurst and Sidcup U.D.C. For most of its length, it is set on an embankment and, in this area, it is crossed only by the road under it at Sidcup Station. The eastern boundary of Footscray Lane is also an established boundary and the western boundary is that of the Borough. Shops, public houses and garages exist at intervals all along Halfway Street and Station Road and Lamorbey Baths and the Lamorbey adult education centre in the "Glade" are well used by local residents and the latter also by Lamorbey Park Cricket club. The greater part of the parish of Holy Trinity church, Lamorbey, lies between the Shuttle and the railway. The Residents Association has premises in Burnt Oak Lane adjoining the "Hollies" childrens home and the area at the junction of Burnt Oak Lane and Hurst Road with Halfway Street is currently being considered for designation as a conservation area. Local play and other groups meet in the old church school. The Sidcup Golf Club is sited on Lamorbey Park.

Blackfen. This proposed ward contains the residential area to the west of the substantial Blackfen shopping centre. The boundaries comprise the A2 trunk road in the north, River Shuttle with its various attributes previously mentioned in the south, Wellington Avenue (which is a metropolitan road, and bus route, and existing ward boundary, a parish boundary and a school catchment area boundary) in the east and the Borough Boundary in the west.

The resulting ward is regular in shape, identifies the Blackfen community, which was developed on flat land between the wars, and contains the usual elements of a community, e.g. 3 churches (Baptist, Catholic and Church of England), junior and infants school, Roman Catholic school, library, 2 public houses, pop-in-parlour etc. etc. all used by local residents. The ward is not too
similar to the Lamerby North-west ward which existed under the old Chislehurst and Sidcup U.D.C. prior to the introduction of 4-member wards when the Bexley London Borough was created.

Blendon/Penhill. This proposed ward comprises two adjoining communities centering around their common local shopping parades at Blendon Road and Penhill. The Penhill area comprises the residential area lying immediately to the east of Blackfen shopping centre which was almost entirely developed as one estate in the 1930's and which includes Penhill Park and sports pitches, a junior and infants school and a girls secondary school. The Blendon area was largely also built as one estate (the Blendon Hall estate) in the 1930's. Up until 1965, Blendon was joined across the A2 as part of a larger 'Upton' Ward. Subsequently, it became part of the present 4-member St. Mary's ward. Geographically it is on relatively high ground to most of St. Mary's ward to which it has no history of especial community attachment.

It is suggested that it is convenient to link the Blendon and Penhill districts together as one ward in this almost wholly urban developed area. The Blendon shops and the Penhill shops adjoin each other and together form a total of over 40 in all centered around the Penhill and Kestlake roundabouts. In addition, there are 2 churches (Methodist and St. James C. of E. - the parish of the latter covering the whole of Blendon and extending as far west as Westwood Lane, Blackfen) 2 garages, the Three Blackbirds public house and a play group etc. The east-west links of Blendon Road/Blackfen Road (bus route), Blendon Road/Sherwood Park Avenue and Bladindor/Rowley Avenue are considered to be a slightly stronger than any North/South links.

The proposed boundaries consisting of the A2, River Shuttle and Wellington Avenue (the features of which are mentioned above) are clear and easily understood in a developed urban area, and define almost exactly the limits of the communities concerned. As in the Lamerby Area, the river Shuttle is a polling district boundary (and pre-1965 ward boundary) with the continuing feature of the parks along its banks providing a 'break' between roads.

ST. MARYS. The present 4-member ward is by far the largest in the Borough. With the exception of the Coldblow Community (see later) the proposed ward reverts to almost exactly the same boundaries as existed before 1965. Probably "Bexley" ward would be more appropriate, but this could appear confusing with the Borough name, and so the historic name of St. Marys is preferred. Parkhill Road, Hurst Road and Bourne Road all converge on Bexley Village, a designated conservation area, with its variety of Public Houses, Restaurants, churches, Freemantle and other Halls, library etc. Bexley Cricket Club is one of the oldest in the country and there are 3 tennis clubs, various sports grounds, courts etc. and schools of various
descriptions. The Hurst Place community centre is used by people from a wide area and has an especially active horticultural society.

The proposed boundaries are the A2, Proposed Bexley By-Pass, River Cray, Railway, Footscray Lane (previously mentioned) and the River Shuttle. At the time that the proposals were prepared for submission to the Commission, the Bexley By-Pass, which will link the Bexley end of the dual carriageway North Cray Road with the Bourne Road roundabout by the A2 by means of a similar new road across the farmland to the east of St. Mary's Cemetery, was to have been commenced by 1981. Unfortunately, due to the financial situation, the GLC have now postponed the commencement date. However, the line of this road is settled and it is common ground between all parties on Bexley Council and the local residents that it be completed as soon as possible. To this end, pressure on the GLC is being applied for an early start. The By-pass will be a strong landscape feature and it is felt appropriate to take account of it in shaping boundaries under the present review.

NORTH CRAY/COLDFLEW. The two adjoining areas of North Cray and Coldflew, each of which is a community in its own right, are the only basically rural communities in the Borough. Unfortunately each, on its own, is insufficiently large to be a ward in its own right. However, they are of roughly equal size and because of their common characteristics, and rural interests, it is felt to be better and more appropriate to the needs to their inhabitants if they were linked together as one ward rather than have each rural community 'tagged' onto a larger 2 or 3 member urban ward where their interests could be overlooked. The two areas which are as follows are directly linked to each other via North Cray Road/Vicarage Road/Dartford Road.

COLDFLEW. This community of about 1200 electors is situated on high ground to the east of Bexley, abuts Dartford Heath and included part of Joydens Wood. Its only road link with Bexley Village is via Vicarage Road and Dartford Road. It is separated from the Village by farmland and this separation will be emphasised further when the last section of the dual carriageway Bexley By-Pass is built. The community has its own small shopping centre at the junction of Baldwins Park with Dartford Road, there is an active resident's association with club premises in Baldwins Park, and play groups and other organisations operate from the Baptist Church Hall. Both the Baptists and the Church of England have long recognised the needs of parishioners in the Coldflew area by having churches both there as well as in Bexley Village. It is unfortunate that the Vicar of St. Mary's, Bexley failed to mention this in his letter to the Commission. The fact that the St. Mary's Church centre recently constructed on a site behind Baldwins Park is 20 yards outside the Borough Boundary does not mean that it should be overlooked as forming part of the Coldflew Area's community facilities. In fact, the Coldflew district has much
in common with the group of roads in Dartford (e.g. Beaconsfield etc) by the gates of Bexley Hospital. In this respect, Bexley's Education Department has just carried out a survey of the number of children of Junior and Infant school age living in the Coldblow area and the number of these actually attending the nearest Bexley Council schools in the Village. A copy of a letter from the Education Department giving the survey results is attached and this shows that the overwhelming number of children in the Coldblow Community do not attend the schools in the Village although these have a high reputation. Most, in fact, appear to attend the Maypole School just inside the Dartford border. The steep hill between Coldblow and Bexley may be an influence. Apart from farms, there are a number of riding schools and kennels in the area and most of the area is in the green belt. Residents have the choice of main shopping in Swanley, Dartford, Sidcup, Bexley or Bexleyheath.

North Cray. It is a more scattered, if also more historic, area than Coldblow containing about 1350 electors. But its scattered nature with occasional pockets of development seems to have resulted in a strong community feeling between residents who make a point of knowing their neighbours. There is a strong Residents' Association which is perhaps the most active in the Borough. North Cray Social Club is sited near the "White Cross" Public House in North Cray Road. The old church of St. James is situated to the west of North Cray Road, whilst its church hall, opposite by Catton's Way, is used by the Scouts, Women's Institute etc., and old persons friendship.

Again, almost the whole area is in the green belt and has some fine scenery. Apart from the various farms and nurseries there are a large number of riding schools (about 700 horses are believed to exist) and part of Joydens Wood is included. Whilst a parade of 13 shops exists at High Beeches, this serves the St. James garden estate and part of the Ellenborough area only. Most North Cray residents are motorised and variously shop in Swanley, Bexley, Sidcup, Orpington and Bexleyheath.

In connection with the largely pre-war St. James garden development, it is not felt that there are in fact any strong links between this and the post war Ellenborough Road estate or between the North Cray area generally and the Ellenborough development. The only direct access between the Ellenborough Area and the North Cray area generally is the one narrow service slip road by the High Beeches shops. We do not feel that these 13 shops in any way form the centre of a community and, indeed, apart from them, there are no other community facilities at that point. The Ellenborough area is otherwise completely separated from North Cray not only by the dual carriageway North Cray Road itself, but by iron railings along the edge of this road also.
There is, unfortunately, some local resentment by residents in the North Cray area that the Ellenborough Estate was ever built at all, prior to its commencement in 1937, fields only existed and these separated the pre-war Mount Culver area in Footscray and the St. James garden development. The suggestion that the school and clinic on the Ellenborough estate provides community facilities used by North Cray residents generally is a much exaggerated statement, as their prime use is by the estate residents themselves. A survey, along the lines of the one in Goldblow, of the number of children of junior school age in the North Cray area and the number of those attending the badly named North Cray junior school on the Ellenborough estate was recently also carried out by the Council's Education Department. This showed that, for whatever reason, the majority of children in North Cray do not attend what might seem to be their local school. (A copy of the Education Department's letter is enclosed). In this case, it was paradoxically found that many children travelled the slightly longer distance into schools in Bexley Village. This feature of children attending schools other than those in whose catchment areas they are is one peculiar in Bexley to the rural areas of North Cray and Coldblow, as a similar survey in other parts of the Borough indicates that it is common for over 90% of children to attend the area catchment school. It may be of interest to mention that the active North Cray Residents' Association, which, we understand, has a membership in three figures, has never contained more than about 14 or 15 from the Ellenborough area (we gather currently less). We also note that this Association has raised no objection to the principal of the Commission's proposals, but has merely requested that Buxley Close be placed in the North Cray and Coldblow ward. (A similar point was made by the St. James Parochial Church Council originally). This cul-de-sac, which was built separately from the Ellenborough estate, has its only outlet direct onto North Cray Road. We would have no objection to its transfer, but feel that this should be a decision for the Commission as North Cray Road is such a strong boundary at this point.

Summarising, the proposal to create a North Cray and Coldblow ward is felt desirable because residents in these two rural communities of matching size can then have a councillor elected by the rural community alone. The interests of these communities have a different emphasis from those in the urban areas, viz: the apparent inadequacy of schools, poor country bus services, rural footpath and road maintenance, preservation of green belt, vandalism on farms, difficulties presented by the riding schools (whose interests have to be considered) and heavy traffic flows and crossing difficulties in their areas.

Accepting that, whenever ward boundaries are drawn, there will be some ties between the areas on either side, we do not consider that, on balance, there are any community ties as between the Goldblow area and Bexley Village or between the North Cray area.
and the Ellenborough Estate (in our view more associated with Footscray) which over-ride the advantages of the proposed rural ward. The proposed boundaries of the A2, eastern and southern borough boundary, North Cray Road and the River Cray are all strong. The boundary behind High Beeches and the St. John's shops is an established polling district boundary with electors to the north polling to the north in the Church Hall by Catton's Way and those in the south polling to the south. Although the construction of the Bexley-by-Pass has been put back, we feel that its line (identifiable) is to be preferred as a ward boundary in view of its future significance. It is accepted that, in the interim, to travel from North Cray to Coldblow along North Cray Road and Vicarage Road, would for a very short distance, require the traveller to enter St. Mary's ward. If the Commission feel this inappropriate, then the line of the latter roads should be taken as the ward boundary rather than the By-Pass route.

**SIDCUP EAST/FOOTSCRAY AREA.** The existing Sidcup East ward described below has now grown to a point where it more than fully justifies 4 members as against the Commission's criteria of a maximum of 3. At the same time, recognition of the new divided Footscray community is an obvious requirement. The Commission's draft proposals are a straightforward resolution of both points:

**Sidcup East.** This ward consists of the urban development to the east of the A222 Station Road/Chislehurst Road bounded by the railway in the north. The ward is exactly the same as the existing over-large Sidcup East Ward less only the part of Footscray joining the new Footscray Ward. It is felt that little further comment is needed. The area has obvious boundaries and, being intensely developed, any division of it would be unnecessarily destructive.

**Footscray.** We were astonished to see from their representation to the Commission, that the Labour Party were suggesting that there was, in effect, no Footscray community; a fact belied by every map and reference book.

The 'community' was originally a village at a crossing point on the river Cray, and a number of old buildings still remain, including the restored Tudor Cottages, some 250 year old houses in Church Road, some shortly to be restored shops in the High Street, All Saints Church which dates from Norman times, and the Dower House and Stables on Footscray Place etc.

Up to about the mid-1950's the population was relatively small although extending from Palm Avenue/Mount Culver Avenue in the east to the large houses at the lower end of Sidcup Hill in the west. During the last 20 years, however, builders have re-developed the large houses, and the Council has demolished and developed the poor tenaments around the High Street.
In addition, between 1957 and 1960 was built the Ellenborough estate joining onto the Palm Avenue/Mount Culver area, and the new shops appeared in the High Street. These developments have created a new enlarged community against the background of the historic old one, and the area now contains a total of about 54 shops (including 2 banks and a supermarket) in the High Street and Maidstone Road, 2 public houses (including the ancient Seven Stars), All Saints Church of England Church, Footscray Baptist Church, Footscray Social Club in Cray Road, Footscray Church of England School, the Baugh Old People's Home, the Bus Depot etc. A number of local organisations have sprung up, e.g. Footscray residents and tenants associations, play groups in the Baptist Church etc., and there is no doubt that a Footscray Community feeling exists.

The southern part of the proposed ward contains some industry centered around Powerscroft Road, the A.20 and the area to the south of Maidstone Road generally, whilst it is felt appropriate that the open parkland to the north of Rectory Lane known as Footscray Meadows (formerly the grounds of Footscray Place) should be included.

It is also felt that the Ellenborough area is akin to a Footscray ward and should be included. The main entrance and exit to and from it is via the old Footscray Roads of Palm Avenue and Mount Culver. The only other exit is via the slip road by the High Beeches shops and this is much a secondary route. Almost certainly the High Beeches shops attract their trade (apart from the St. James area) only from Ellenborough Residents in the immediate vicinity, whilst a majority of the estate together with Palm Avenue/Mount Culver area would find a far wider choice of shops in Footscray. In addition, Footscray with its bus station is the centre for communications and many residents must also work in the Footscray factories. It should also be mentioned that the catchment area of the 'North Cray' junior school on the Ellenborough Estate extends westwards to Cray Road and thus includes amongst other things the Footscray housing estate west of the river. Other than from 1 councillor, no objection from residents to the inclusion of the Ellenborough area into Footscray have been made.

In the west of the ward, the Commission's proposals to include the eastern side of Oxford Road in Footscray are not thought to be appropriate. The roads Durham Road to Oxford Road should be considered as a complete group on community grounds and have more in common with the Sidcup Community rather than Footscray. In addition, a polling station is used in Oxford Road and it is inappropriate to have residents on the east side of the road polling elsewhere. It is felt it is, in this case, better to use the rear gardens as a boundary for the short distance involved rather than the centre of the road - a point agreed by all parties in the Council Chamber.
Although the ward boundaries may appear irregular especially in the north due to their running round the perimeter of Footscray Meadows they are readily identifiable on the ground and are easily understood.

Sidcup West. This ward contains the urban community to the west of the A22 Station Road/Chislehurst Road. It is identical to the existing Sidcup West Ward. The electorate is exactly right and no reason whatever is seen for any division or change in its long established shape. The boundaries could scarcely be clearer.
### Recommended Wards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northend</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8093</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>7830</td>
<td>2.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnehurst</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4864</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>4810</td>
<td>1.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnehurst North</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3236</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>2990</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crayford</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7701</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>7790</td>
<td>2.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erith</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7743</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>8730</td>
<td>3.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northumberland</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8170</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>7950</td>
<td>2.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heath</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belvedere</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>91.02</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>8770</td>
<td>3.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thamesmead East</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6190</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>8090</td>
<td>3.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bostall</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7606</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>7530</td>
<td>2.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>66005</td>
<td>23.51</td>
<td>64470</td>
<td>24.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Wickham</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8571</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>8500</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Michael's</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8118</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>8040</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brampton</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8176</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>7900</td>
<td>2.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7954</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>8060</td>
<td>3.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falconwood</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2783</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>2800</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danson</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7628</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>7520</td>
<td>2.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upton</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8138</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>7960</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>51368</td>
<td>19.49</td>
<td>50780</td>
<td>19.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamorbey</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7607</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>7500</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackfen</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5122</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>5050</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brendon &amp; Perhill</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7469</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>7290</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidcup East</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8772</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>8678</td>
<td>3.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidcup West</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7737</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>7570</td>
<td>2.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Mary's</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8647</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>8585</td>
<td>3.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grey</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4677</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>4497</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>50101</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>49170</td>
<td>18.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total for Borough</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>161,471</td>
<td>164,420</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Average per Councillor**

|                | 2,637 | 2,652 |
APPENDIX 9

Amendments in the description of wards in the Commission's proposals.

(Note: Where in two cases brackets occur the words within the brackets are not part of the description but are an indication where the description may be found.)
**Sidcup East Ward**

Delete: "Sidcup Hill, thence southeastwards along said road to Oxford Road, thence southwestwards along said road"

and substitute:

"Sidcup Hill, thence southeastwards along said road to a point opposite the southeastern boundary of the gardens of the houses on the southeastern side of Oxford Road, thence southwestwards along the southeastern boundary of said gardens and continuing"

---

**Gray Ward**

Commencing at a point where the southern boundary of the Borough meets the eastern boundary of Sidcup East Ward, thence generally northeastwards, southeastwards and northeastwards along said ward boundary to the point where it meets the southern boundary of St. Mary's ward, thence northeastwards, eastwards and southeastwards to the point where it meets the southeastern boundary of the Borough then generally southwards, southeastwards, northeastwards and southwestwards along said boundary to the point of commencement.

---

**St. Mary's Ward**

Delete from and including "A2 Trunk Road" to "Sidcup East Ward"

and substitute:

"A2 Trunk Road, thence southeastwards along said road to the southeastern boundary of the Borough, thence generally southwestwards along said boundary (to the southern boundary of polling district SE as described in polling district order and along that boundary to) the proposed Bexley By-Pass thence southeastwards along said proposed By-Pass to Northcroy Road, thence southwestwards along said road to the track between said road and a bridge across the River Cray at map reference TG 434072350, thence northwest along said track to said bridge, thence southwestwards along the River Cray to the northern boundary of Sidcup East Ward"
Northumberland Heath Ward

Commencing at a point where the northern boundary of Brompton Ward meets the eastern boundary of Hestall, thence generally northwards along said eastern boundary to Stream Way, thence northeastwards along said Way to Grid Reference TQ 489477750, thence due north to the stream situated to the north of Stream Way, thence generally northeastwards along said stream to Brook Street to meet the eastern boundary of Belvedere Ward, thence northwestwards and northeastwards along said eastern boundary to the western boundary of Erith Ward, thence generally southeasterwards and southwards along said western boundary to Colyers Lane, thence westwards along said lane to Erith Road, thence southwesterwards along said road to the eastern boundary of Brompton Ward, thence northwesterwards along said boundary and westwards and northwesterwards along the northern boundary of said ward to the point of commencement.

Belvedere Ward

1. After "to the Abbey Wood - Dartford railway, thence eastwards along said railway to"

(a description of the eastern boundary of the part of the existing Belvedere ward north of the railway followed by)

"to the northern boundary of the Borough, thence southeasterwards along said boundary to a point being in prolongation northeasterwards of the western boundary of Parcel No. 4233 on 1:2500 Plan TQ 50-5180 Edition of 1966, thence southwesterwards to and along said western boundary to the road known as Crabtree Manorway across the Abbey Wood - Dartford railway to Lower Road"

2. Delete "Crabtree Manorway, thence southwards along said road to Lower Road"

3. For "Parsonage Ward" substitute "Northumberland Heath Ward"
Thamesmead East Ward

Delete from "along the northern boundary of the Borough to a point being in prolongation" to "along said Crabtree Manorway to the northern boundary of Belvedere Ward" and substitute "along the northern boundary of the Borough to the western boundary of Belvedere Ward thence southwestwards south eastwards, westwards and southwards along said boundary to the northern boundary of Belvedere Ward."

Erith Ward

1. Delete "Thamesmead East Ward" where those words first occur and substitute "Belvedere Ward."

2. Delete "and continuing northeastwards along the eastern boundary of Thamesmead East Ward."

Delete descriptions in Commission's proposals of:

- Bootscray Ward
- North Cray Coldblow Ward
- Parsonage Ward
- Northumberland Heath Ward.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME OF WARD</th>
<th>NO. OF COUNCILLORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BARNEHURST</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BARNEHURST NORTH</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BELVEDERE</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLACKFEN</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLANDON AND PENHILL</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOSTALL</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRAMPTON</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRAY</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRAYFORD</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHRISTCHURCH</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DANSON</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAST WICKHAM</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERITH</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FALCONWOOD</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAMORBEY</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTH END</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTHUMBERLAND HEATH</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST MARY'S</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST MICHAEL'S</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIDCUP EAST</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIDCUP WEST</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THAMESMEAD EAST</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPTON</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LONDON BOROUGH OF BEXLEY - DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED WARD BOUNDARIES

Note: Where the boundary is described as following a road, railway, river, canal or similar feature it should be deemed to follow the centre line of the feature unless otherwise stated.

EAST WICKHAM WARD
Commencing at a point where the Dartford - Falconwood railway meets the western boundary of the Borough, thence generally northwards, eastwards and south-eastwards along said borough boundary to Upper Wickham Lane, thence generally southwards along said lane to the Dartford - Falconwood railway, thence generally westwards and south-westwards along said railway to the point of commencement.

ST MICHAEL'S WARD
Commencing at a point where the Dartford - Falconwood railway meets the eastern boundary of East Wickham Ward, thence generally northwards along said boundary to the eastern boundary of the Borough, thence northeastwards and south-eastwards along said borough boundary to Brampton Road, thence south-eastwards along said road to Oakhampton Crescent, thence south-westwards along said crescent to Gipsy Road, thence south-eastwards and south-westwards along said road to the Dartford - Falconwood railway, thence westwards along said railway to the point of commencement.

FALCONWOOD WARD
Commencing at a point where East Rochester Way meets the western boundary of the Borough, thence north-westwards along said boundary to the southern boundary of East Wickham Ward, thence north-eastwards along said ward boundary to Bellegrove Road, thence south-eastwards along said road to Westwood Lane, thence south-westwards and south-eastwards along said lane to Hook Lane, thence south-westwards along said lane to East Rochester Way, thence north-westwards along said way to the point of commencement.
DANSON WARD

Commencing at a point where the eastern boundary of Falconwood Ward meets the southern boundary of East Wickham Ward, thence generally eastwards along said southern boundary and continuing along the southern boundary of St Michael's Ward to a point being in prolongation northeastwards of Clifton Road, thence southwards along said prolongation and Clifton Road to Park View Road, thence southeastwards along said road to a point opposite the eastern boundary of the Sports Ground, thence southwestwards to and along said boundary and continuing southwestwards along the western boundary of No 22 Danson Mead to the rear boundaries of Nos 22-4 Danson Mead, thence southeastwards along said boundaries and continuing in a straight line to the northernmost corner of the rear boundary of No 2 Danson Road, thence southwards along the rear boundaries of Nos 2-40 Danson Road to the northern boundary of No 42 Danson Road, thence northwestwards along said northern boundary to the rear boundary of said property, thence southwards along said rear boundary and in prolongation thereof to the northern carriageway of Danson Park situated to the south of No 42 Danson Road, thence eastwards along said carriageway and continuing southeastwards along the eastern carriageway of said park, at the rear of East Lodge, to a point being the prolongation westwards of Bean Road, thence eastwards along said prolongation to Danson Road, thence generally southwards along said road to a point opposite the northern boundary of Danson Park South Lodge, thence northwestwards and southwards to and along the northern and western boundaries of said lodge to Lakeside Close, thence westwards along said close to the eastern boundary of Bexley Swimming Pool, thence southwards and westwards along the eastern and southern boundaries of said pool to the access road from East Rochester Way to said pool, thence southwards along said access road to East Rochester Way, thence northwestwards along said way to the eastern boundary of Falconwood Ward, thence northeastwards, northwestwards and northeastwards along said ward boundary to the point of commencement.

BLACKFEN WARD

Commencing at a point where the western boundary of the Borough meets the southern boundary of Falconwood Ward, thence southeastwards along said ward
boundary and continuing along the southern boundary of Danson Ward to Westwood Lane, thence southwards along said lane and continuing generally southeastwards along Wellington Avenue to Burnt Oak Lane, thence westwards along said lane to the western carriageway of the road known as The Oval, thence southwestwards along said road to Willemsley Avenue, thence south-westwards along said avenue to the River Shuttle, thence generally north-westwards along said river to the western boundary of the Borough, thence generally northwards along said boundary to the point of commencement.

BLENDON AND PENHILL WARD

Commencing at a point where the eastern boundary of Blackfen Ward meets the southern boundary of Danson Ward, thence southeastwards along said southern boundary and continuing along East Rochester Way to Arbuthnot Lane, thence southwestwards along said lane to Meadowview Road, thence southeastwards along said road to Riverdale Road, thence southwestwards along said road to Bridgen Road, thence southeastwards along said road to the River Shuttle, thence generally south-westwards and north-westwards along said river to the eastern boundary of Blackfen Ward, thence generally northeastwards and northwards along said boundary to the point of commencement.

LAMORBEY WARD

Commencing at a point where the western boundary of the Borough meets the southern boundary of Blackfen Ward, thence generally southeastwards along said ward boundary and the southern boundary of Blendon and Penhill Ward to Penhill Road, thence southeastwards along said road to and continuing along Foots Cray Lane to the Dartford - New Eltham railway, thence generally westwards along said railway to the western boundary of the Borough, thence generally northeastwards along said boundary to the point of commencement.

SIDCUP WEST WARD

Commencing at a point where the western boundary of the Borough meets the
southern boundary of Lamorbey Ward, thence eastwards along said ward boundary to Station Road, thence southwards along said road and continuing southwards along Elm Road and generally southwestwards along Chislehurst Road to the southern boundary of the Borough, thence northwards along said southern boundary and northeastwards along the western boundary of the Borough to the point of commencement.

SIDCUP EAST WARD

Commencing at a point where the eastern boundary of Sidcup West Ward meets the southern boundary of Lamorbey Ward, thence eastwards along said southern boundary and continuing northeastwards along the New Eltham - Dartford railway to a point being in prolongation of the northeastern boundary of No 141 and rear boundary of No 143 Longmead Drive, thence southeastwards to and along said boundaries and continuing to and along the rear boundaries of Nos 1-35 Betterton Drive, thence southeastwards along said rear boundaries and the northeastern boundary of No 83 Riverside Road to Riverside Road, thence northeastwards along said Road and continuing along the track between Riverside Road and Upper College Farm to a point opposite the northeastern boundary of the Works, thence southeastwards, northeastwards and southeastwards along said northeastern boundary and in prolongation thereof to the River Cray, thence generally southwestwards along said river to Five Arch Bridge, thence northwards along the footpath from St James's Church to St Andrews Road to the rear boundary of Nos 17 and 19 St Andrews Road, thence southwestwards along the rear boundaries of Nos 17-47 St Andrews Road and Nos 13-43 Ladbrooke Crescent, thence southwestwards and northwestwards along the southeastern and southwestern boundaries of the Car Park between Nos 43 and 45 Ladbrooke Crescent to the rear boundary of Nos 45 and 47 Ladbrooke Crescent, thence northwards along the rear
boundaries of Nos 45 to 75 Ladbrooke Crescent to the footpath between said
crescent and Bexley Lane, thence northwestwards along said footpath to a
point opposite the southeastern boundary of the Parklands School, thence
southwestwards to and along said boundary to the track between North Cray
Wood and Bexley Lane, thence generally southwestwards along said track to
Bexley Lane, thence southwestwards along said lane to Rectory Lane,
thence northwestwards along said lane to Knoll Road, thence generally
southwestwards along said road to the road known as Sidcup Hill, thence
southeastwards along said road to a point opposite the southeastern boundary
of No 112 Sidcup Hill, thence southwestwards to and along said boundary
and continuing southwestwards along the rear boundaries of Nos 1-23
Oxford Road to the northern boundary of Sidcup Hill County Primary School,
thence northwestwards along said boundary and southwestwards, southeastwards
and southwestwards along the western boundary of said school and the north-
western boundary of said playing field, thence southeastwards along said
footpath to a point opposite the southeastern boundary of the allotment
gardens, thence southwestwards to and along said southeastern boundary to
the footpath leading to Watery Lane, thence southwestwards along said
footpath to Watery Lane, thence northwestwards along said lane to the
eastern boundary of Parcel No 7450 on Ordnance Survey 1:2500 Plan TQ 46-4770
Edition of 1960, thence southwestwards along said boundary and in
prolongation thereof to the southern boundary of the Borough, thence
northwestwards along said boundary to the eastern boundary of Sidcup West
Ward, thence northwards along said boundary to the point of commencement.

CRAY WARD

Commencing at the point where the southern boundary of the Borough meets the
eastern boundary of Sidcup East Ward, thence generally northeastwards
along said ward boundary and continuing generally northeastwards along the
River Cray to the bridge at NG reference TQ 4934072990, thence southeast-
wards along the track between said bridge and North Cray Road to said road, thence southwestwards along said road to a point opposite the northeastern boundary of the property known as Avenue Lodge, thence southeastwards to and along said boundary and the northern boundary of parcel No 3566 as shown on OS 1:2500 plan No TQ 48/4972 edition of 1964 to the western boundary of The Grove, thence northwards along said boundary to the northern boundary of The Grove, thence northeastwards and southeastwards along said boundary and continuing eastwards along the southern boundary of parcel No 4688 to the southern boundary of parcel No 5900, thence eastwards along said boundary and northeastwards along the eastern boundary of said parcel to the southern boundary of Pinewood Cottage, thence eastwards along said boundary to the unnamed road east of said property, thence northeastwards along said road to the access road to the Hurst Grid Sub Station, thence generally southeastwards along said road and southwestwards along the access road on the south side of the said sub station to NG reference TQ 4996272528, thence due southwards to the eastern boundary of the Borough, thence generally southwards and southeastwards along said boundary to the southern boundary of the Borough thence northwestwards and southwestwards along said boundary to the point of commencement.

**ST MARY'S WARD**

Commencing at a point where the northern boundary of Sidcup East Ward meets the eastern boundary of Lamorbey Ward, thence northwestwards along said eastern boundary to the southeastern boundary of Blendon and Penhill Ward thence generally northeastwards, northwestwards and northeastwards along said southeastern boundary to the A2 Trunk road, thence southeastwards
along said road to the eastern boundary of the Borough, thence generally southwards and westwards along said boundary to the northeastern boundary of Cray Ward, thence generally northwestwards and southwestwards along said boundary to the northern boundary of Sidcup East Ward, thence northwestwards and southwestwards along said northern boundary to the point of commencement.

UPTON WARD
Commencing at a point where the northern boundary of Blendon and Penhill Ward meets the eastern boundary of Danson Ward, thence generally northwards eastwards and northwards along said eastern boundary to Bean Road, thence eastwards along said road to Red House Lane, thence northeastwards along said lane to Upton Road, thence northwestwards along said road to the road known as the Broadway, thence southeastwards along said road and continuing along Watling Street and London Road to the western carriageway of Bourne Road, thence generally southwestwards along said road to a point opposite the western boundary of the Garage at the northeastern corner of the Recreation Ground thence southwards to and along said western boundary and northeastwards along the southern boundary of said garage to the western boundary of the Scout Hall, thence southwards along said western boundary and the western boundary of the Allotment Gardens to the southwest corner of said allotment gardens, thence southeastwards in a straight line to the eastern boundary of the Borough at Grid Reference TQ 5125074052, thence southwestwards along said boundary to the northern boundary of St Mary's Ward thence northwestwards and westwards along said ward boundary and the northern boundary of Blendon and Penhill Ward to the point of commencement.
CHRISTCHURCH WARD

Commencing at a point where the eastern boundary of Danson Ward meets the southern boundary of St Michael's Ward, thence eastwards along said southern boundary and continuing along the Falconwood - Dartford railway to Erith Road, thence southwards along said road to the northern boundary of Upton Ward, thence northwestwards, southwards, southwestwards and westwards along said northern boundary to the eastern boundary of Danson Ward, thence generally northwestwards along said eastern boundary to the point of commencement.

BRAMPTON WARD

Commencing at a point where the northern boundary of Christchurch Ward meets the eastern boundary of St Michael's Ward, thence northeastwards, northwestwards and northeastwards along said eastern boundary of Brampton Road, thence southwards along said road to Long Lane, thence southeastwards along said Lane to a point opposite the eastern boundary of No 322 Long Lane, thence northeastwards along said boundary to the southern boundary of No 115 Little Heath Road, thence southeastwards along said boundary and northeastwards along the rear boundaries of Nos 115-107 Little Heath Road to Dunwich Road, thence northeastwards across said road to the southwestern boundary of No 105 Little Heath Road, thence southeastwards along said boundary to the rear boundaries of Nos 105-91 Little Heath Road, thence northeastwards along said rear boundaries to and southeastwards along the access road to the rear of Nos 90-46 Dunwich Road, thence crossing Penshurst Road and continuing along the rear boundaries of Nos 44-2 Dunwich Road to the northeastern boundary of No 31 Bedonwell Road, thence southeastwards along said boundary to Bedonwell Road, thence northeastwards along said road to a point opposite the northern boundary of No 90 Bedonwell Road, thence southeastwards to and along said boundary to the rear boundaries of Nos 12-5 Arnside Road, thence northwards and southeastwards along said rear boundaries and continuing southeastwards along
the rear boundaries of Nos 152-120 Rydal Drive to the rear boundary of No 89 Heversham Road, thence northeastwards along said rear boundary and southeastwards along the northern boundary of said property to and crossing Heversham Road to the northern boundary of No 114 Heversham Road, thence southeastwards along said northern boundary to the rear boundaries of Nos 114-110 Heversham Road, thence southwards along said rear boundaries to the rear boundary of No 112 Rydal Drive, thence southeastwards, northeastwards and southeastwards along the rear boundaries of Nos 112-2 Rydal Drive, crossing Burchington Close and Dalmeny Road to Erith Road, thence generally southwestwards along said road to the northern boundary of Christchurch Ward, thence westwards along said ward boundary to the point of commencement.

BOSTALL WARD

Commencing at a point where the eastern boundary of St Michael's Ward meets the western boundary of the Borough, thence northwards along said borough boundary to Grid Reference TQ 4744478406 on said borough boundary, thence eastwards in a straight line to the northwest corner of No 31 The View thence southeastwards along the rear boundaries of Nos 31-1a The View and continuing along the western boundaries of Nos 144 and 146 Woolwich Road to Woolwich Road, thence northeastwards along said road to a point opposite the western boundary of No 67 Woolwich Road, thence southwards to and along said western boundary to the rear boundaries of Nos 2-16 Harold Avenue, thence southwards along said rear boundaries to Osborne Road, thence westwards and southwards along said road to Dryhill Road, thence generally southeastwards along said road to Bedonwell Road, thence generally southeastwards and southwards along said road to the northern boundary of Brampton Ward, thence generally southwestwards and northwestwards along said ward boundary and continuing
along the eastern boundary of St Michael's Ward to the point of commencement.

NORTHUMBERLAND HEATH WARD

Commencing at the point where the northern boundary of Brampton Ward meets the eastern boundary of Bostall Ward, thence generally northwards along said eastern boundary to Stream Way, thence northeasterwards along said way to NG reference TQ 4894277750, thence due north to the stream situated north of Stream Way, thence generally northeasterwards along said stream to Brook Street, thence northwesterwards along said street to Erith Road, thence northeasterwards along said road to Fraser Road, thence southwesterwards along said road to the footpath known as Birch Walk, thence southwesterwards along said footpath to Kempton Close, thence southwesterwards along said close to Bexley Road, thence southwesterwards along said road to Park Crescent, thence eastwards along said crescent to Hind Crescent, thence southwards along said crescent to a point opposite the southwestern boundary of Erith District Hospital (General), thence southwesterwards and along said boundary and continuing southwesterwards along the rear boundaries of Nos 47-3 Buxton Road to Avenue Road, thence westwards along said road to Ramsden Road, thence southwards along said road to Colyers Lane, thence westwards along said lane to Erith Road, thence southwesterwards along said road to the northern boundary of Brampton Ward, thence northwesterwards along said boundary to the point of commencement.

BELVEDERE WARD

Commencing at the point where the northern boundary of Bostall Ward meets the western boundary of the Borough thence northwards along said borough boundary to the Abbey Wood to Dartford railway, thence eastwards along said railway to a point opposite the drain situated west of No 37 Maida Road, thence northwards to and along said drain and in prolongation thereof
to the rear boundary of No 65 Sutherland Road, thence westwards along said
boundary to the western boundary of said property, thence northwards along
said boundary, the western end of Sutherland Road and continuing northwards
along the western boundary of No 70 Sutherland Road and in prolongation
thereof to Yarnton Way, thence eastwards and northeastwards along said
way to the access road from said way to Norman Road, thence eastwards
along said access road to Norman Road, thence northwards along said road
to the unnamed access road to the sewage works, thence westwards along
said access road to a point opposite the eastern boundary of parcel
No 1760 as shown on OS 1:2500 plan TQ 48/4980 edition of 1970, thence
northeastwards to and along said boundary and in prolongation thereof
to the northern boundary of the Borough, thence eastwards along said
boundary to a point being the prolongation northeastwards of the western
boundary of parcel No 4233 as shown on OS 1:2500 plan TQ 50/5180 edition
of 1966, thence southwestwards along said prolongation and boundary to the
road known as Crabtree Manorway, opposite the access road to Burts
Cottages, thence southwestwards along said Crabtree Manorway to Lower
Road, thence westwards along said road to Halt Robin Lane, thence south-
wards along said lane to Fox House Road, thence generally southwards and
southeastwards along said road to the northern boundary of Northumberland
Heath Ward, thence generally southwestwards along said boundary to the
northern boundary of Bostall Ward, thence generally northwestwards along
said boundary to the point of commencement.

THAMESMEAD EAST WARD

Commencing at a point where the northwestern boundary of Belvedere Ward meets
the western boundary of the Borough, thence northwards and northwestwards
along said western boundary and generally southeastwards along the northern boundary of the Borough to the northwestern boundary of Belvedere Ward thence generally southwards and westwards along said boundary to the point of commencement.

ERITH WARD

Commencing at a point where the eastern boundary of Belvedere Ward meets the northern boundary of the Borough, thence southeastwards along said borough boundary to a point being the prolongation northeastwards of the portion of railway which runs northeastwards to southwestwards along the pier at Chalk Farm Wharf, thence southwestwards along said prolongation and said railway to the footbridge between Reddy Road and Watts Bridge Road, thence westwards along said footbridge and Watts Bridge to South Road, thence southwards along said road and Northend Road to Colyers Lane, thence westwards, northwestwards and westwards along said lane to the eastern boundary of Northumberland Heath Ward, thence generally northwards and northwestwards along said boundary and westwards along the northern boundary of said ward to the eastern boundary of Belvedere Ward, thence generally northeastwards along said ward boundary to the point of commencement.
BARNEHURST NORTH WARD

Commencing at a point where the northern boundary of Christchurch Ward meets the eastern boundary of Brampton Ward, thence northeastwards along said eastern boundary and continuing northeastwards and eastwards along the southern boundaries of Northumberland Heath Ward and Erith Ward to the western boundary of the property known as Northwode, thence southwards along said boundary and southwards and southeastwards along the western boundary of Colyers Primary School and Normandy County Primary Schools and continuing southeastwards along the rear boundaries of Nos 52a to 2 Edendale Road to the access path to the rear of Nos 73-85 Eversley Avenue, thence westwards along said access path to Edendale Road, thence southwards along said road to Eversley Avenue, thence westwards along said avenue to the road known as Parkside Cross, thence southwards along said road to the Dartford - Falconwood railway, thence westwards along said railway to the point of commencement.

BARNEHURST WARD

Commencing at a point where the northern boundary of Upton Ward meets the eastern boundary of Christchurch Ward, thence northwards along said eastern boundary to the southern boundary of Barnehurst North Ward, thence eastwards along said southern boundary to the road known as Parkside Cross, thence southwards along said road to Parkside Avenue, thence eastwards along said avenue to Taunton Close, thence southwards along said close to a point opposite the northern boundary of No 3 in said close, thence eastwards to and along said boundary and southwards along the rear boundaries of Nos 3 and 4, and westwards along the southern boundary of No 4 in said close to the footpath between Taunton Close and the track running to the north of the Golf Course, thence southwestwards along said footpath to its junction with said track, thence southwestwards in a straight line to the eastern boundary of the Allotment Gardens situated to the north of Mayplace Road East,
thence southwestwards along said boundary to Mayplace Road East, thence
southeastwards along said road to Woodside Road, thence southwestwards along
said road to a point opposite the northern boundary of No 33 Woodside Road,
thence westwards to and along said boundary and southwards along the rear
boundaries of Nos 33 and 31 Woodside Road to the rear boundaries of Nos 2
to 96 Lea Vale, thence westwards and southwards along said rear boundaries
and continuing southwards along the rear boundaries of Nos 1a to 3 Shenstone
Close to the southern boundary of No 1a Shenstone Close, thence eastwards
along said southern boundary to Shenstone Close, thence southeastwards along
said close to Old Road, thence southwestwards along said road to the northern
boundary of Upton Ward, thence northwestwards along said boundary to the point
of commencement.

CRAYFORD WARD
Commencing at a point where the eastern boundary of the Borough meets the
eastern boundary of Upton Ward, thence generally northwestwards along said
ward boundary and generally northeastwards along the eastern boundary of
Barnehurst Ward to the Falconwood - Dartford railway, thence eastwards and
southeastwards along said railway to the eastern boundary of the Borough,
thence generally southwestwards along said boundary to the point of commencement.

NORTH END WARD
Commencing at a point where the northern boundary of Crayford Ward meets the
eastern boundary of Barnehurst North Ward, thence generally northwards along
said eastern boundary to the southern boundary of Erith Ward, thence eastwards
along said southern boundary and generally northwards along the eastern
boundary of Erith Ward to the northern boundary of the Borough, thence east-
wards and generally southwestwards along the northern and eastern boundaries of the Borough to the northern boundary of Crayford Ward, thence northwestwards and westwards along said ward boundary to the point of commencement.